

THREE LETTERS:

13.

ONE TO

THE COMMITTEE OF CORRESPONDENCE;

ONE TO

“PLAIN TRUTH, JUNIOR;”

AND ONE TO

“PLAIN FACT;”

IN SUPPORT OF THE “CANDID ADDRESS” TO THE EPISCOPALIANS OF PENNSYLVANIA ON THE AFFAIRS OF THE DIOCESE;

BY PLAIN TRUTH.

MAY, 1827.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Letter to the Committee, &c.	3
Letter to "Plain Truth, junior"	15
Letter to "Plain Fact"	32

A LETTER

TO THE

Rev. George Boyd, the Rev. G. T. Bedell, the Rev. Charles M. Dupuy, Mr. Joseph S. Riley, and Mr. Samuel J. Robbins.

BRETHREN—I have read with attention the short address to the public, published in the Philadelphia Recorder of April 14th, 1827, under your signatures, and also the editorial remarks of the reverend editor of that paper, one of your number.

My object in addressing these observations to you at this time, is to correct some misapprehensions into which you have fallen, to point out some means by which alone Plain Truth is to be refuted, and to strengthen by a few additional disclosures the positions of that pamphlet—I shall prosecute this threefold purpose without any other method than that of taking up the paragraphs of the two pieces alluded to above, and founding upon them such comments as they seem to call for. To amplify this painful discussion, is far from being an object of my ambition, or an agreeable occupation of my time. But having put my hand to the plough, neither the ruggedness of the soil, nor the roughness of the work, shall induce me to look back with regret at engaging in it, so long as I shall be empowered to preserve a becoming equanimity of spirit, or so long as I shall perceive that the cause of true piety, and the interests of the church of Christ are to be subserved by my efforts. Personal motives, in pursuing this ungrateful task, you may rest assured, I have none. I cherish towards you no unkindly feelings, and, although I appear as a witness against you on this trying occasion, yet I am dragged by a sense of duty to the bar to deliver my testimony; and if you can clear yourselves from the imputations, which the facts and reasonings of "Plain Truth" have cast upon you, none of your friends will rejoice more sincerely than the humble individual who has adopted that signature.

I. You will recognize the following as your card,

"TO THE PUBLIC.

The undersigned, having been publicly arraigned in a printed pamphlet, by an anonymous writer, who signs himself "Plain Truth," accused of *bribery* and *falsehood*, and many other offences against good morals and religious principle, take this opportunity to say, that they do not feel themselves called upon to reply to the charges of their *concealed accuser*. Though loaded with revilings, they desire not to revile again. The cause they serve, and with which their names (however unworthily) are associated, is of too sacred a nature to be dis-

turbed for a moment by the conflicts of "carnal" contention. To justify or to explain, they hold themselves pledged, whenever an accusation shall be properly preferred. To the noisy din of party reprobation, they can pay no regard, neither will it hinder them from pursuing that path of duty which God, in his providence, has marked out before them.

GEORGE BOYD,
G. T. BEDELL,
CHARLES M. DUPUY,
JOSEPH S. RILEY,
SAMUEL J. ROBBINS."

April 11, 1827.

1. "The undersigned, having been publicly arraigned in a printed pamphlet, by an anonymous writer, who signs himself 'Plain Truth,' accused of *bribery* and *falsehood*, and many other offences against good morals and religious principle, take this opportunity to say, that they do not feel themselves called upon to reply to the charges of their *concealed accuser*."

This statement, that you have been accused of *falsehood* and *bribery*, evinces, that you must have read the pamphlet of "Plain Truth" with a perturbation of mind, that prevented you from perceiving, that a charge of *error* is not a charge of falsehood, and that the *spirit of bribery* may sometimes pervade actions, which do not amount to bribery itself, and, in the doing of which, the agents might be too much blinded to perceive the real character of the transaction. I have placed upon the pages of the Candid Address, your engagement under your signatures, to pay the expenses of those delegates to the approaching Convention in whom you can confide, to whom it will not be perfectly convenient to defray their own expenses; and I have given my reasons, why I think the spirit of bribery to pervade the offer. Whether, however, that engagement amounts to actual bribery, or merely displays the spirit of bribery, is but a slight matter compared with the truth or falsity of the fact on which the charge rests. Prove that the Circular containing the offer is not yours, and you get rid of the whole difficulty at once.

Whether you have not committed some "offences against good morals and religious principles," is a question which must be decided by the truth or falsehood of the fact, that you have issued the *Circular*, which stands on the pages of the Candid Address signed by your names. If that production be acknowledged to be yours, or rather, if it be not disavowed and disproved, moralists and religious men will, I fear, continue to regard it, unless the principles of morality and religion be changed, as affording too abundant and too strong a proof of the accuracy of that painful charge. You may have fallen into these "offences" ignorantly, or unintentionally, but, however that circumstance may clear your skirts from guilt, it cannot alter the abstract nature of the proceeding.

But you say, you do not feel yourselves called upon to reply to the charges of your *concealed accuser*. It is true, I am concealed from your knowledge, though not, as appears from the editorial article in the Recorder, from your kind conjectures. It is true, also, that duty has compelled me, by the development of facts, to appear before

the Episcopal public as your accuser. Had I penned accusations against you without offering *any* evidence to support them, or had the pamphlet been written with a single view to injure your personal characters, or had not its painful developments been imperiously called for, by long fostered and now existing prejudices against the bishop and his friends, and by the general ignorance which prevails, respecting the points on which the two parties in this diocese are divided, there might have been some plausibility in the ground which you assume, that you will not reply to an *anonymous* writer. But look yourselves, and let the public look at the real circumstances of the case. All the material facts with which you five gentlemen are connected, are accompanied with the evidence which sustains them, or are too well known to be denied by you with any success. The principal ground is the Circular—that is the text book of the commentary. The insult to the Bishop in the Convention, is a notorious fact—The motion to introduce the coloured clergyman into the Convention, was heard by hundreds, and once stood on the original minutes of that body. The attempt to introduce newly organized congregations into the Convention is upon the printed journal, and the members of that body, and others who were present, cannot have forgotten that Mr. Robbins, in pressing their admission, stated, that he himself had *visited some of these congregations during the summer*, whether to aid them in organizing or not, was not said by him. That Mr. Boyd travelled through different parts of the diocese, between the date of the call of the Convention and the time of its meeting, is a fact well known, and that he did, during his excursion, represent the Rev. Dr. Wilson as unsound on some points of doctrine, is a matter of which too abundant evidence exists to admit of its being denied. That a fund was raised to pay the expenses of the country delegates, is well known to very many individuals in this city and elsewhere in the diocese, and is so strongly corroborated, by the analogous efforts to raise money for the same purpose, in reference to the approaching Convention at Harrisburgh, that I presume, it neither can, nor will be questioned. That the proposal, to postpone the election of an Assistant Bishop, has not been acceded to by your friends, is a fact too currently known to need any formal proof. Now, all these are statements which are accompanied by adequate evidence, or which are too well known to the great body of episcopalians, to require the formal proof which can be adduced. You are called upon, ergo, not so much to answer anonymous charges, as to disprove well known facts—and whether the individual, who has collected and embodied these facts, puts his name to the pamphlet, or continues to remain where he still is, unknown to you, can neither affect the truth of the facts themselves, nor the correctness of the inferences deduced from them. You seem to forget too, the *anonymous* Circulars, which appeared in behalf of “the cause you serve” last summer, under the signature of “Hooker,” and “A Fellow Layman.” Ask yourselves, likewise, whether there is any

very great difference between an *anonymous* pamphlet, and a *confidential* Circular—between a plain statement of facts, unaccompanied by a name, and a confidential dissemination of calumnies with the authority of signatures, giving proportionate credit to the misrepresentations; and, however iniquitous you pronounce the proceeding of “Plain Truth” to be, the same breath will utter a heavier verdict upon your own case. The author of “Plain Truth,” has given to you and to the public, the *facts* on which his “charges” are founded, and the reasonings by which they are deduced. It is therefore within your power to attempt a disproof of the facts, and a refutation of his reasonings. He has divested the pamphlet of the authority of names, and left it, unpatronised, to influence by the naked strength of its statements, arguments, and inferences. But very far from this course, was the one pursued by you. You have represented the bishop, one half of the clergy of the state, and a large body of the laity—as opposed to “truth and piety”—as maintaining opinions, and pursuing a policy, requiring to be resisted by pious men—as possessing the disposition to intrigue—and you have added to the representations, the authority of five respectable names, three of them being clergymen, two of whom, at least, have stood conspicuous before the church in this diocese for a few years past, and whose statements, from their being clergymen and prominent clergymen, will command no small degree of confidence. And yet, not one fact, not one argument, not even a statement of what are the opinions and policy of the bishop and his friends, has been afforded to those who received your Circular, to enable them to judge of the truth of your representations. A cool, naked, *confidential* statement has been made by you, implicating the moral, religious, and professional characters of your bishop and brethren, not only without giving them an opportunity to rebut the charge, but without even meaning that they should know of these heavy imputations being thrown upon them. Had not your Circular been providentially brought to the light, the episcopalians of this diocese, who had received with implicit confidence its contents, might never have known the different light in which *Facts* are calculated to place the bishop and his friends, from that in which they have been so gloomily depicted by the pen of the Committee of Correspondence. If the author of Plain Truth has exposed himself to the charge of being a *concealed accuser*, because he did not put his name to the facts which he has detailed, it must be said, that such a charge issues with an awkward grace from the lips of the authors of the confidential Circular.

2. But I pass to the second sentence of your short address.

“Though loaded with revilings, they desire not to revile again.”

If you have been reviled by the author of Plain Truth, the reviling must be found either in the *facts* which he has stated, or in the *inferences* he has drawn from them, or in the *manner* in which he has written the pamphlet. That the *facts* constitute revilings, will altogether depend upon their being true or false. If they are false statements, they deserve the appellation you have given them. But

if they are true, they are no more "revilings" than the testimony of a witness in a court of justice can be called such, because it happens to state facts which tell against the character of the party implicated. Is it *reviling* Mr. Robbins, to say that he offered a cool insult to Bishop White, when that fact is known to multitudes? Is it *reviling* him to publish the fact, that he moved for the introduction of new congregations into the Convention, which had been organized at a particular time, when the record of the circumstance is on the Journal? Is it *reviling* Mr. Boyd and Mr. Bedell, to state the circumstance that they moved for the admission of a coloured clergyman into that body, whose vote would have decided the question in reference to the episcopacy, when the motion was made in public body, and once stood on the record of its proceedings? Is it *reviling* you five gentlemen to assert that you have published a confidential circular signed by your names, when the circular itself is placed before the public in all its length and breadth? Facts are not revilings unless they are false; and when you have proved that these which have been stated by Plain Truth to be unfounded, then he will be among the foremost to recall and to reprobate them.

That the *inferences* and reasonings of Plain Truth bear the character ascribed to them, will depend upon the question whether they are correct or incorrect, well founded or unauthorized. Let them, however, be shown to be unsound and inconclusive, before they are so pronounced. I do not arrogate infallibility to the operations of my mind, or the statements of my pen, but I cannot suppose that the episcopalians of Pennsylvania are so far tied down to the authority of the committee of correspondence, as to receive their *bare assertion* as irrefutable evidence in such a case as this. Besides, if my reasonings and deductions are to be considered as "revilings," were I disposed to seek the friendly shelter of an *example*, I have only to turn round and place myself under the expanded wing of the circular of the committee. For if inferences from public facts are "revilings," what must be said of your *confidential imputations* upon the moral and religious characters of the bishop and his friends?

But, perhaps you refer to the *manner* in which the pamphlet has been written. Here a bold denial of the charge may very safely be ventured. Whatever may be thought of the facts or the necessity of disclosing them, whatever may be thought of the logical correctness of the arguments, whatever may be thought of the clearness or obscurity of the link which connects the inferences with the statements, the public has awarded to the *manner* in which Plain Truth has performed his painful duty, the praise of being temperate, gentlemanly, and christian—an award to the justice of which the editor of the Recorder has set something like his own seal, when he said of it that it was "rather more moderate" than he had expected. In his view, at least, it has reached the *comparative degree* of excellence in this respect. If amidst the mortification and pain which attended the hasty preparation of that pamphlet, and which results from the public disclosure of the transactions it reveals, there has been any

mixture of satisfaction, it was found in the consciousness of being actuated by a good motive, and of having endeavoured to repress all unkind feelings towards the individuals implicated. And I will not deny that I have derived gratification from perceiving how universally the tenor and spirit of the "candid address" have been approved, and especially from the fact of the unlooked for verdict in its favour, which has been extorted from the pen of the reverend editor alluded to, one of your committee.

3. But let me invite your attention, brethren, to the *third* sentence of your address to the public.

"The cause they serve, and with which their names (however unworthily) are associated, is of too sacred a nature to be disturbed for a moment by the conflicts of 'carnal' contention."

Now, what is the cause you serve? As defined by the circular, it is an association to defend piety and truth against the friends of Dr. Wilson, and to oppose the opinions and policy of Bishop White and his supporters. This is the "sacred" cause with which your names are associated, and which is not for a moment to be disturbed by the conflicts of "carnal" contention. It is not my desire, nor my design, to misrepresent you on this point; but I can put no other meaning to your words. Whether this cause has not been already somewhat tainted by the spirit of carnal contention, let those judge who have read your circular, and who remember the as yet undisproved statements of "Plain Truth." I may not correctly apprehend the signification of the word "carnal," but I have been accustomed to consider it as expressing something opposite to "spiritual." If I am sound in thus defining the word, I would very respectfully ask you, whether it was a *carnal* or a *spiritual* act, to pen and distribute a circular, implicating the religious and ministerial characters of the bishop and his friends? Was it a *carnal* or a *spiritual* offer, made by you, to pay the expenses of delegates to the Convention? Was it a *carnal* or a *spiritual* business, to collect funds for such a purpose? Was there no infringement upon the territories of what is "carnal," when you dictated to the churches to appoint men as deputies in whom you could confide, proscribed such as would not agree with you in principle, and recommended that the same persons who attended the Special Convention should attend at Harrisburg, provided they *remain of the same mind*? Was there nothing "carnal" on your side of the question, during the proceedings of the late Special Convention? Let your memories recur to all that was said and done by you on that occasion, and before you cast the stone at Plain Truth, you may perhaps feel a disposition to abandon this point. If, however, you are disposed to reprobate his publication as an act of carnal contention, what language will you apply to the productions of "Hooker," and "A Fellow Layman?" What shall be said of the broad avowal of Mr. Ridgely, in respect to his object in attempting to organize a congregation at Frankford? My readers will admit, that if the cause you serve is not to be *disturbed* by the efforts of carnal contention, it does not at least disdain their aid in its behalf. But, to show that the spirit of carnal

contention is not restricted to our side of the question, I am constrained to lay before you the following letter, written to a reverend gentleman of this city, from a neighbouring country parish, by one (an entire stranger to him) who cannot be denied to be a warm and zealous, though he may not be a very conspicuous, or a very prudent, supporter of the cause you serve. The letter requires no other reply, and no other reprobation, than to be submitted to the public eye, with this caption—"Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

"CHESTER, April 16th, 1827.

"SIR—If you are the author of a pamphlet, entitled "*Plain Truth*," (which, by the way, is a *tissue of falsehood and misrepresentations*,) I am surprised at your audacity in forwarding it to any person who was a member of the late Special Convention, particularly to those against whom you have hurled your ecclesiastical denunciations, and assailed with the envenomed pen of a foul slanderer. You have, like the midnight assassin, concealed yourself under cover of a fictitious signature, to blast the reputation of your brethren with the charge of *bribery and corruption*. But mark me—if you escape the execration to which this would subject you if from behind the screen, the just vengeance of God will fall heavy upon your guilty conscience. The gentlemen against whom you have made the above charge, were authorized, not by a cabal, but by a majority of the members of the late Special Convention, to do what they have done. It is well known, that many of the most worthy members of the country churches are in very moderate circumstances, and on whom the expense of going to Harrisburg would fall heavy, or, otherwise, the want of means prevent their going at all. That provision should be made for such, is sanctioned by long established practice, when the present unhappy divisions were unknown in the church.

"At present, time will not permit me to go further into this matter. If you are not the author of the pamphlet alluded to, of course you will not consider this communication as addressed to you; but you may rest assured, that where it would have been difficult to find persons in many of the country congregations, who would undertake the journey to Harrisburg, before the circulation of "*Plain Truth*," those congregations will now be well represented.

"You will discover that I have endorsed a more appropriate title-page* to the work, under which I desire it may hereafter be distributed.

"Yours, &c.

H. MYERS."

4. I proceed to notice your next sentence.

"To justify, or to explain, they hold themselves pledged, whenever an accusation shall be properly preferred."

The precise meaning of this pledge does not appear on the face of it. What is intended by an accusation *properly* preferred, seems somewhat doubtful. It may import, that the accusation be made before that Convention, whose purity would seem to have been tampered with, by your offer of paying the expenses of the deputies. It may mean, that the accusation be made in the shape of an impeachment, with a view to trial, of the reverend gentlemen whose names are appended to the Circular. Or it may mean, that the author of *Plain Truth* should avow himself before the public. The precision of the

* The following is the suggested title-page:—"A Tissue of Falsehood and Misrepresentations, to serve the purposes of the Devil among the Episcopalians of Pennsylvania, in relation to the present situation of the affairs of the Diocese. By the Rev. Mr. ———."

Committee of Correspondence, so remarkable throughout the *Circular*, seems to have forsaken them here. Should Plain Truth avow his name, it might be, for aught this pledge imports, that the Committee would turn upon their heels, with the intimation, that the discovery of the author was not the thing they meant—the putting his name to the pamphlet would not make it “an accusation *properly* preferred.” But, whatever may be intended by this offer to justify or explain, or however the Committee intended it should be educed, it must be obvious, that, as the principal statements of the “Candid Address” are supported by documentary evidence, or rest on the testimony of hundreds, no exposition of any name can add to, or detract from, the force and conclusiveness of that testimony, or the inferences founded upon it. So far as the five gentlemen are concerned, on whose account these observations have been called forth, the matter may be put on a very narrow footing. They have only to deny the Circular to be theirs, or, if they admit it, to come out, and explain or defend the obnoxious positions it contains. The same public which has listened to the painful accusations of the Candid Address, will, I have no doubt, prove impartial in its decision upon the defence which may be offered. It is very easy to do as has been done by the reverend editor of the Recorder—to pronounce the whole pamphlet a “tissue of misrepresentations.” But it is not quite so easy to disprove the statements of public journals, or to obliterate well known facts from the memories of multitudes. Doubtless, there are facts in that pamphlet which that reverend gentleman would heartily rejoice, could they be divested of their reality, or successfully shown to be misrepresentations. But he has evinced himself a bolder or a looser writer than was anticipated, when knowing the genuineness of the Circular, the certainty of the facts respecting the introduction of the coloured clergymen, and the new churches, the publications of “Hooker,” and “A Fellow Layman,” the insult of Mr. Robbins to the bishop, and the purchase of the pew by Mr. McElroy, (let alone other points,) he sweepingly, and without reserve, denominates the *whole* production “a tissue of misrepresentations.” If this assertion of his be true, it would require but a brief occupation of some of his leisure moments to prove it; and without meaning to employ a taunting expression, I would respectfully suggest to the Committee, that a plain and manly refutation of the arguments and facts of the Candid Address, though it be *anonymous*, will have infinitely more weight with the public, than the most dignified card, even though supported by their signatures.

5. On the last sentence of your short address, I will only remark that its readers will perceive that it breathes the same determined spirit which is so conspicuous throughout the Circular, and if I wanted any further evidence that the two productions were penned by the same hand, and sanctioned by the same committee, I should undoubtedly conceive myself to possess it in this final paragraph. There was never any very confident hope indulged that the exposure of the proceedings of the committee would induce them to pause, much less to stop in the career, on which they had set out. The spirit and tenor

of the Circular forbade the expectation. Let me remind you, however, brethren, that it is not to the noisy din of party reprobation that you are now called upon to pay regard—but to the wounded characters, insulted feelings, and injured reputations of the bishop, half of his clergy, and hundreds of the laity—men who are your brethren in the church, your equals in society, and some of them your superiors in age—men who have some sensibility in relation to their religious and ministerial characters—and who cannot consent willingly to occupy the painful station of opponents to Truth and Piety in which your circular places them, so long as it continues to be tacitly acknowledged, and to remain before the public, unqualified and unexplained.

II. I here take leave of the committee in order to offer a few remarks on the editorial article from the Recorder, which is inserted at length.

“*Electioneering*.—As we, with others of our brethren, have been made the subjects of a pamphlet, which is filled with misrepresentations, and which has been circulated with the most industrious zeal, we have been solicited by some of our friends to give a formal answer through the pages of the Recorder. This, we think, we have no right to do, as a personal, *anonymous* attack on us, though a matter in which the Episcopal community is interested, may not with propriety be made the subject of discussion through our pages. Though we have no *legal* friend to fight the battles which we might be indisposed to fight ourselves, we think it more than likely that some answer will be given to this tissue of misrepresentations, for we are not completely destitute of friends. As to ourselves, though the matter may produce a momentary disquiet, we have ceased to be frightened by these gunpowder plots. A very short time ago, by an *anonymous* writer, we had our *life threatened* for the course we pursue, and as this did not happen to deter us, “Plain Truth” steps forward and tries to become our *ecclesiastical executioner*. The pamphlet, however, will be eventually its own best answer—it is meant as a mere *electioneering trick*; and though written most probably by one whose daily occupation it is “to make the worse appear the better reason,” it is rather more moderate than we expected. From our hearts we pity the individual or individuals who so seek our downfall. St. Andrew’s Church would still flourish, and the Recorder would still live, and the Evangelical cause will still grow, even if we were out of the way. We are not worth so much trouble as is bestowed upon us, and our prayer to God is, that we may have the grace to forbear and to forgive. One thing we are sure of;—that God’s good pleasure will be accomplished, and even the “wrath of man shall praise him.” Our principal object is to assure our readers that there will be no discussion of this subject in the pages of the Recorder. All that we have done, or intend to do beside this short article of our own, is the communication of the Committee *under their own hands*.”

The particulars of this document which have not been sufficiently referred to in the preceding observations, will be found to be noticed in the following commentary.

1. The article is headed “electioneering,” and the pamphlet of “Plain Truth,” is said to be “meant as a mere electioneering trick.” If a pamphlet detailing facts, and deducing inferences therefrom, written in a spiritual manner, more moderate than the editor himself expected, and which favours the pretensions of no individual for the Episcopacy, is an electioneering trick, what must be said of the Cir-

cular to which *his* name is affixed, and which instructs, exhorts, encourages, directs, and dictates, in so many matters connected with a party—which is indeed issued as a kind of clerico-political manual, and which was despatched through the diocese at a time posterior to that (if I have been correctly informed) when some proceedings had taken place which opened at least a faint glimpse of the mitre to his eye. If Plain Truth has been guilty of electioneering, he has the satisfaction of knowing that he has not done it for himself.

2. There is hardly any circumstance that more forcibly evinces the consternation produced in the editor's mind by the disclosures of the Candid Address, than the imprudent, uncalled for, unbecoming proscription of the members of the bar, which this article contains. I know not the characters of those members of that profession who belong to St. Andrew's congregation, but in reference to those with whom I am accustomed to associate, I have found none sustaining the unprincipled character ascribed to them. It is not unusual to denounce the lawyers; and in some quarters it may be popular to do so. But when the denunciation comes from the pen of one of the Signers of the Circular, he may aptly be cautioned against throwing stones whilst he continues to occupy so fragile and exposed a habitation. Whether the authorship of Plain Truth does or does not rest with a lawyer, I neither affirm nor deny. But this I will say, that it demanded no extraordinary acuteness to indite the pages of the Candid Address: an honest heart, a fearless pen, and a christian spirit were all the requisites needed for the purpose. The public can observe whether these qualities are or are not displayed in that production.

3. The faint promise of a probable answer by some one of your friends, who though not a legal gentleman, is yet to be relied on to fight your battles, has excited some hope in my mind of seeing an attempt* made to *prove* your assertion that Plain Truth is a "tissue of misrepresentations." It is somewhat curious that if such be its character, that it should have so far disturbed the equanimity of your mind as to produce even a "momentary disquiet."

4. You venture the prediction that the pamphlet "will be eventually its own best answer." If you really thought this, why intimate as you have done, the probability of a reply? or why pledge yourselves to answer its accusations "when properly referred?" You may prophesy smooth things to yourself and to your friends on this subject for the present; but you may rest assured that "the Circular under your hand" has struck a note throughout the church in this state, and I may also add throughout the country, that will reverberate upon your ear with a harshness little like the soothing melody you are now enjoying; unless you have the power, and shall take the pains, to disprove that you were concerned in penning, sanctioning, or circulating it. Though you have ceased to be frightened by gunpowder plots, though you may frame a sentence which

* The attempt has been made—with what success will hereafter appear.

intimates a connexion between the anonymous threatener of your life,* and the anonymous author of the "Candid Address," though you may attempt to create a belief that *your* downfall is the leading object of "Plain Truth," and though you may glory in the unshaken stability of St. Andrew's church, the Philadelphia Recorder and the Evangelical Cause; yet you may learn the estimate which is generally adopted of your connexion with this transaction when you read the opinion of an honest though humble individual, one of your warmest admirers: "I did not think Mr. *Bedell* would have put his name to such a paper. I would not have *my* name signed to it for ten thousand dollars."

5. There is one mistake into which you have fallen, which I deem it my duty formally to correct, though, perhaps, the force of habit may be regarded as a sufficient apology for the misapprehension. I mean, your considering the editor of the Recorder as the prominent object of the remarks of "Plain Truth." I have no desire to pull down any man from the elevation he has gained, or in any way to thwart his ambition of distinction. But truth compels me to say, that in penning the pamphlet, the Rev. Mr. *Bedell* did not occupy a larger space in my thoughts, than any other member of the committee. If there is a more frequent employment of your name than that of others, it is entirely owing to the fact, that circumstances had given a more humiliating conspicuousness to your name in this affair, than to that of any one of your associates. It is possible that some of your immediate friends may seek to sooth your perturbed feelings, by the flattery that they consider the whole of the Candid Address, facts, inferences, arguments, quotations, and all, "a tissue of misrepresentations," and, by levelling, like the author of the Letter from the Country, on page 9, their indignant expressions at the head of the humble individual who has had the temerity to throw a little Plain Truth across your path. They may strive, in your presence, to envelop the pamphlet with the accusations of malignancy, envy, impiety, hostility to truth, party feeling, &c.; but be assured, though the intimation comes anonymously, that there is not one of your intelligent friends that does not deeply regret the unfortunate and mortifying attitude in which you now stand before the public; or who would not rejoice greatly, could your name be detached from that circular, and your character plucked as a brand from that burning. Your friends are too acute not to see, though they may hesitate to tell you their opinion, that insinuations are not facts, that bravado is not argument, and that recriminations are not the materials out of which a successful answer to the representations to "Plain Truth" is to be framed.

* I have been informed that the anonymous letter here referred to threatened the life of Mr. *Bedell* for having recommended Blanco White's book concerning the Roman Catholics. If this be true, how far such a threat on such a topic had any thing to do with the statements of "Plain Truth," and how far it was proper, ingenuous, honourable, or christian, to allude to such a threat in such a way as to create a supposition that your life had been threatened for pursuing the course you have pursued in the Episcopal church, when it was for something totally different, that Episcopal public before whom we both stand must judge.

6. It is altogether a mistake, likewise, on your part, when you suppose and assert that the author of Plain Truth seeks, or even wishes your downfall, or to oppose the slightest impediment to the prosperous career of the congregation of St. Andrew's. He had much higher and purer objects before his mind—the disclosure of the truth, and the enlightening of the public mind upon topics over which the darkness of midnight would gladly have been kept by some, until at least their present schemes had been accomplished. Whatever may be the consequences of the publication to the author, or to the individuals implicated, he has penned it temperately, soberly, and in the fear of God; and as much as he was able, upon the principle of the apostle, when he said, in relation to higher subjects, “We speak not as pleasing men, but God, who trieth our hearts.”

There is one very easy way of settling the matter between “Plain Truth” and the committee who have signed the address to the public. It will be noticed that the facts mentioned by the former may be classified into material, and immaterial. Let the immaterial facts be considered for the present, as out of the question. And let the committee convince the public of the incorrectness of the ensuing statements of the candid address.

1. I have asserted, and am able to prove, that the circular to which their names are appended, on page 17, was issued under the authority, and with the knowledge of Mr. Boyd, Mr. Bedell, Mr. Dupuy, Mr. Riley, and Mr. Robbins.

2. I have asserted, and am able to prove, that bishop White was insulted by Mr. Robbins, as stated on page 5, of my pamphlet.

3. I have asserted, and am able to prove, that Mr. Bedell moved, and Mr. Boyd seconded, the resolution to admit the coloured clergyman into the convention, and Mr. Bedell afterwards seconded the motion to expunge the resolution from the journal.

4. I have asserted, and am able to prove, that Mr. Robbins moved the admission into that body, of the newly organized churches, and that those churches had been organized between the date of the call, and the time of the meeting of the special convention.

5. I have asserted, and am able to prove, that Mr. Bedell avowed his having made the Rev. Mr. Ridgley his assistant by a private arrangement, as stated on page 6, of my pamphlet.

6. I have asserted, and am able to prove, that Mr. Boyd travelled through parts of the diocese between the call of the convention, and its meeting, and did represent Dr. Wilson as being unsound on some points of doctrine. Now let these statements be proved to be untrue: or if acknowledged to be facts, let the inferences and deductions founded on them, be proved to be inconclusive and false. Whether this attempt be made anonymously, or by the committee under their names, let it be done plainly, and without evasion. Such a course, and such a course alone, if it can be *successfully* pursued, will drive the author of “Plain Truth” to the stool of confession, and brand him with deep, and merited infamy.

A Letter to "Plain Truth, Junior."

I rejoice at the appearance of a pamphlet on church affairs under your signature, commenting on a letter signed by several of the bishop's friends, and expressing your views in relation to some important church matters now before the public eye. From your claiming a right on p. 10. to question the qualifications of the laymen who have signed the letter to judge the hearts of the clergy, I must conclude you are a clergyman: and from your deep anxiety to vindicate Messrs. Boyd, Bedell and Dupuy, from the imputations now resting upon their characters as signers of a circular published in the pamphlet I have penned, (as well as from some incidental allusions,) I infer that you are one of those three gentlemen. But whoever you may be, I will state to you the grounds of my satisfaction at your publication.

I rejoice at it, first, as it shows most incontestibly that the views and arguments of "Plain Truth" are unanswerable by you, except by such fierce recriminations as will only serve to strengthen the deep and abiding impression which he has been instrumental in fixing upon the public mind. Secondly, Because, since your commentary is filled with misquotations from the letter which constitutes your theme, and plain distortions in many points of its obvious meaning, it will serve to show the feebleness of the attempt to produce excitement against it, and divert the public mind from that master piece of composition which bears the signatures of Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, Dupuy, Riley and Robbins. Thirdly, It brings before the public a full view of the letter alluded to very cursorily by me, and thus furnishes an opportunity to cool and deliberate men to compare the two productions. Fourthly, It places before the world in an apposite contrast, the leading friends of Bishop White, among the laity on one side, and his leading opponents on the other. Fifthly, It shows the difference of temper and spirit with which you and I are accustomed to regard and to write on church matters. Sixthly, It bears testimony to the moderation with which "the letter" was written, inasmuch as you have been compelled to attempt to infuse a violent spirit into your quotations from it, of which when seen in their connexion with the original, they are destitute. Seventhly, It has forced from you an effort to *laud* Bishop White to the public, which contrasts very awkwardly with the well known opposition of those whom you seek to defend, to his views and policy, and especially with the pamphlet of your coadjutor "Plain Fact." Eighthly, It furnishes me with an opportunity of stating that I have heard that Bishop White has expressed a strong approbation of the pamphlet of "Plain Truth." And finally, It affords me the occasion to inform you, that though you have represented me as a Jesuit, a persecutor, and a liar—and that too in a

pamphlet written during passion week—I cherish no feelings of unkindness towards your person, and have only to regret that you have not met the facts of “Plain Truth” by a denial, and his arguments by something like a refutation.

Although you have not denied a single fact, nor met a single argument alleged in what I have written, yet, as there are some points in your pamphlet which deserve a slight notice, some errors which call for exposure, and some feeble sophistries which those for whom you write may possibly believe to be true and solid arguments, I shall take the trouble to hold the mirror somewhat more plainly to your sight.

As the bishop’s friends have no desire to conceal any thing they have done in relation to church affairs, from the knowledge of their fellow episcopalians, I have obtained permission of the signers of the letter which you have published, to state the following facts relative to its origin, and their connexion with the affair.

A short time after the rising of the Special Convention, a meeting of a few of Bishop White’s friends took place, to confer on the state of the church as disclosed by the proceedings of the majority of that Convention. At this meeting it was deemed expedient that the gentlemen whose names are appended to the letter, should undertake to defend those persons who had supported the side of the bishop at the Convention, against the apprehended attacks of those who were opposed to them, (of which attack an intimation was given in the Recorder of October 28th, 1826,) and to make known such information in relation to the pending question of the choice of an assistant bishop as might be necessary.

The only acts of these gentlemen have been two. They have issued the following circular in relation to the proposal of the Rev. Mr. Meade, of Virginia, to postpone the election during Bishop White’s life: A copy of which was transmitted to Mr. Meade.

(CIRCULAR.)

PHILADELPHIA, NOV. 25, 1826.

SIR—At an interview which took place on the 18th instant, (in the presence of the Rt. Rev. Bishop White and the Rev. Mr. Meade of Virginia,) the Rev. Messrs. Kemper, Boyd, Bedell and De Lancey, and Messrs. Binney and Samuel J. Robbins, concurred in the expediency of putting the annexed question to the clergy and principal laymen of the churches, and of meeting on Monday, the 18th day of December, 1826, at the house of the bishop, at 7 o’clock, P. M. to communicate their opinions.

The undersigned are prepared to answer the question in the affirmative; and it is understood that those who so answer it, pledge themselves to act in conformity.

You are respectfully requested to transmit your opinion, written under the question, to the Rev. Jackson Kemper, so that it may be received by him on or before the 15th day of December next.

We are, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

JAMES MONTGOMERY,
HORACE BINNEY,
JACKSON KEMPER,
GEORGE WELLER,

JOHN C. LOWBER,
CHARLES WHEELER,
J. R. INGERSOLL.

QUESTION.

Is it expedient not to propose the choice of an assistant Bishop at the next state Convention, nor at any future time, during the life of the present Bishop, without at least six months previous notice to the clergy and churches, by the Bishop?

The other act was the issuing "the letter," which has been made the subject of your attack. This was sent as a private letter, that so it might be shown only to episcopalians, to prevent it from being thrown into the hands of other denominations of christians. It was not designed to be, nor has it been kept secret from the knowledge of the members of the church. The truth is, that in some places the letter was read at promiscuous vestry meetings, and at one within my knowledge, even to a congregation. There was nothing *confidential* about* it; and as you have merely *said* that in one case it was directed to be shown to none on your side of the question, without giving any evidence, the remark must be taken as merely *an assertion*.

You have thus before you all the correspondence of the gentlemen whose names are affixed to that letter. Whether as free and full a disclosure of what has been done by the committee, whom you labour to defend, will be placed before the church, remains to be seen.

The attempt which you have made by the aid of misquotations, perverted sentences, and mutilated extracts, to force that letter to speak the language, and breathe the spirit of your "circular," (I say *your*, for I consider myself writing to one of the committee,) forcibly evinces the depth of your shame for the production, and its incapability of defence. Candour, fairness, and truth, are all promiscuously sacrificed on the altar of recrimination. The gentlemen concerned have no slight reason to be thankful that you inserted their letter on the pages of your Address; for a perusal of the letter is the strongest reply that can be made to the larger portion of your pamphlet.

By the agency of such means as you have employed, I would undertake to manufacture out of any half dozen of your sermons, a system of doctrine that would make you stare. Allow me the privilege of misquoting them—allow me to put together disconnected passages—allow me to mutilate the language, and I will prove either of the committee to be a teacher of the boldest and the broadest heresies that ever infested the church of Christ—even to be opposed to truth and piety. I do not mean to detail all these points of unfairness and

* Copies of this letter, I am informed, were placed in the hands of various individuals for the express purpose of having its contents disclosed among episcopalians. If any of those individuals, or even if any individual member of the committee has sent it in the way you mention, it was done on his own authority, and without the advice or consent of the signers of the letter. To be used for the good of the church, was the object for which it was written, and the one for which it was issued and circulated. I am authorized by the committee to say, that no further privacy was intended than to keep it from the eye of other denominations of christians.

error; nor even to inquire how far they are consistent with controversial honesty, or religious sincerity, or christian truth. Whatever else may be thought of "Plain Truth," it will not be denied that he has treated his adversaries fairly in the matter of quotation; and placed before the *Junior*, an example which however either the precipitancy of youth, the hot irritation produced by unexpected disclosures, or the cooler sagacity of an experienced pamphleteer, has induced him to disregard.

A few of these perversions are deserving of notice as specimens—

The letter of Messrs. Binney, &c. contains this language:—

"Let us have at *Harrisburg* a free, full, wise, and independent body of the real friends and lovers of religion and of the church. The vessel demands prudent, experienced, forecasting pilots during the *existing* storm."

This language which relates only to the proceedings of the Convention, you have applied* to the ecclesiastical control of the concerns of the church—and boldly assert it to be equivalent to saying, "it requires that *we* (the signers of the letter) should have the helm."

Again—The letter of Messrs. Binney, &c. says—

"Let each vestry make provision for the expenses of its deputies if it be necessary," and urges as a reason the fact, that at the late Special Convention many persons acted obviously under a sense of obligation, to subserve the views and purposes of those in the Convention who had paid their expenses.

Even this plain statement you have *misrepresented* to be equivalent to their saying and arguing—

"Make provision for the expenses of your deputies, and, as many voted on their side at the late Special Convention, because their expenses were paid, do you do the same, and of course they will vote for us."

Whether the language of the Letter has been in these cases fairly and honestly interpreted, let the honest and candid judge for themselves.

That you and the public may have an opportunity of seeing the statements of these two documents in juxta position, I have inserted their material portions in opposite columns.

The letter of Mr. Binney, &c. &c. says:—

1. "We do not question the piety of the motives, nor the integrity of the characters of those who are opposed to us. God forbid that we should do so. But of the obvious tendency and the prospective consequences of their sentiments, and policy, we may without any violation of charity express our opinion."

The Circular of Mr. Boyd, &c. &c. says:—

1. "We are *associated* not for the purpose of elevating an individual; but for the defence of truth and piety—for principles, not men."

* P. T. Junior, p. 11.

2. The Letter recommends, "That the deputation should consist in every case of able, prudent, zealous men, the old and tried friends of religion, and the church."

3. The Letter says—"Let each vestry (the body which appoints them) make provision for the expenses of its deputies, if it be necessary."

4. The Letter says—"Be careful to appoint substantial, prudent, discreet, experienced, and stable men to that body"—(viz. the Convention.)

5. The Letter says—"The vessel demands prudent, experienced, forecasting pilots during the existing storm, and without these she is in manifest peril of being wrecked." "Let us have at Harrisburg, a free, full, wise, and independent body of the real friends, and lovers of religion and the church."

6. The Letter states, to what the tendency of the opinions and policy of the opponents of the bishop and his friends will lead.

7. The Letter makes no inquiries as to who are to be the delegates.

8. The Letter says nothing about paying the expenses of delegates, except to recommend its being done by each vestry.

9. The Letter says nothing about raising money by collection or otherwise.

10. The Letter asks for no answer, and solicits no information.

2. The Circular urges that "It is highly important in the present state of things, that the same persons who attended the Special Convention, and who *remain* of the same mind, should, in all cases, if practicable, attend at Harrisburg; and if they cannot, that other delegates should be chosen *in whom entire confidence can be placed.*"

3. The Circular says—"In all cases where it is not *perfectly* convenient for the delegates to defray their own expenses, *we* (Mr. Boyd, Bedell, Dupuy, Riley, and Robbins, the Committee of Correspondence of an Association) think it proper that they should be paid, and *provision to that effect will be made.*"

4. The Circular exhorts: "to keep the advantage which we have already gained; and if possible to procure an additional number of delegates, who will agree *with us in principle.*"

5. The Circular says, "*we* confidently expect that the brethren will come to the next Convention **** and proceed in *all* their future deliberations under the influence of the *pledge* which was given when we were last together."

6. The Circular broadly asserts: "our objections are not so much to the man, as to the opinions and policy which it is intended to support" without saying what the opinions and policy are, or whereto they lead.

7. The Circular asks, "who will attend as delegates, and from what churches?"

8. The Circular inquires, "what amount will be necessary to defray the expenses incurred by the attendance of delegates from your neighbourhood?"

9. The Circular asks: "can any money be raised by a congregational collection, or otherwise to be applied to the paying the expenses of delegates?"

10. The Circular asks, "have you any information which you think it important to communicate?" and says: "please to answer this letter as soon as possible."

11. The Letter says nothing about any committee throughout the state, and alludes to no association.

12. The Letter presents a full account of the origin, and failure of the Rev. Mr. Meade's attempt to procure a postponement of the election.

13. The Letter says nothing about giving any instructions to the delegates, in relation to the matters coming before the Convention.

11. The Circular calls upon "the members of a committee throughout the state, to take the matter into serious and deliberate consideration,"—and speaks of being ASSOCIATED "for the *defence* of piety and truth."

12. The Circular simply states, that the proposal "has not been acceded to," without even the fairness of saying that the failure rested with their own party. It might be supposed that it was owing to Bishop White's friends.

13. The Circular says, "we would recommend that these (the deputies to the Convention) should be chosen as soon as possible **** that the deputies may be *informed in season of all the bearings of the important question* upon which they will be called to deliberate and to decide."

Even with all the zeal and ingenuity lavished on the attempt, you have failed to prove that "the Letter" bears any other character than the one ascribed to it by Plain Truth. It states facts which you have not ventured to deny. It expresses opinions which you have not been able to controvert. It communicates information of which a vast body of the Episcopalians of this state were ignorant. And it is penned in a temperate, and forbearing spirit, which contrasts very happily with the exclusive and unqualified representations of your Circular. Is there any thing said in it about pledges? Is there any financial suggestions for collecting money? Have the gentlemen who signed it *engaged* to defray the expenses of any one individual? Have they not expressed the opinion that the vestry of each church ought to bear the expenses of its delegates, and that in this way alone the church can hope to have a free and independent body of Episcopalians at the Convention? Have they not urged that the momentous questions which are likely to be agitated by that body should be settled by the agency of pious, prudent, cautious, temperate, and aged men? Have they asked even for the reappointment of the same gentlemen who voted with them at the Special Convention? Have they not denounced the system of offering money to pay expenses, by others than their constituents, as calculated to bias the opinions of those who receive it? There is not a single passage in that letter of which the gentlemen who signed it can possibly be ashamed—nothing at which honest men need to be uneasy—nothing which they do not fully believe to be true—nothing of which they have not some capability of proving, as will be evinced to you and to the public, before you reach the conclusion of these remarks.

But it is necessary to follow "Plain Truth, *Junior*," with some degree of system.

1. You assert that one of the signers of the Letter has said, it went against him to vote against a Virginian, but that he was appointed a

deputy to the special convention, on the express understanding that he would stick by those who had appointed him; and you say, that some of the delegates of St. Stephen's church were pledged to vote as they did, and only voted as they did, because they were pledged.*

In reference to the first point, let the public note the fact, that upon the question of the assistant bishop, the *laity* of the special convention *did not vote at all*. The question whether a Virginian should, or should not be chosen, did not come before *them*, as the journal shows. As regards the second point, that the deputies of St. Stephen's church were pledged, I have in my hands the most satisfactory *official* evidence that *no pledge* was ever proposed to, or exacted from any delegate from St. Stephen's church in relation to his voting on any conventional question. And that in the appointment of delegates to the late Special Convention, there was no pledge or previous understanding in regard to the individual to whom they would give their votes.

2. Whether the caution of the signers of the Letter of Messrs. Binney, &c. against *insidious attempts* to send men to the approaching convention, pledged to mere party views and purposes, was, or was not wise and well founded, the following statements, in addition to what was so obvious in the Special Convention, will furnish the Episcopalians of this state some grounds to make up an opinion.

I give them on the authority of the gentleman who communicated them. Directly after the receipt of the confidential circular of Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, Dupuy, Robbins, &c. dated 22d Jan. 1827, the then vestry proceeded to elect delegates for Harrisburg. Of this election, one of the vestrymen, a friend of the bishop, *was ignorant* until the first of April. He then stated to the vestry, that he considered the election of deputies illegal, and gave them notice that he would endeavour not only to change the delegation, but the vestry, on Easter Monday. On Easter Monday an election took place for vestry. There were only two persons belonging to the old vestry friendly to the bishop's views. Service for the day concluded at twelve o'clock; directly after service, the (opposite) party proceeded to an election for a new vestry: in place of those two gentlemen, two persons were elected, neither of whom belong to the church: the vestry then proceeded to elect delegates to convention. The same persons who attended the Special Convention were elected. This was all done before one o'clock: and all the voters were nine, seven of whom constitute the new vestry. Immediately after dinner, at one o'clock, the bishop's friends repaired to the church to vote, and found the doors locked, and neither judges nor tellers there: in fact, the election was not open one hour; it being well known, that if there had been a fair, open election, a vestry, and delegates, would have been elected favourable to the bishop's views. *Seventeen gentlemen* of the most respectable standing, duly qualified as electors, are willing to go before a justice of the peace, and take an oath, that immedi-

* P. T. Junior, page 11, 14.

ately after dinner, and at the *usual time* of electing a vestry, they were at the church, and that the doors were closed. Thus you see that nine men, seven of whom constitute the vestry, have elected a vestry and delegation to suit their purposes, contrary to the will of the majority of the qualified electors, and to the most respectable part of the church.

Here is a beautiful illustration of the blessed consequences of the "Confidential Circular." Of this church, the rector, whilst he was pursuing his theological studies, enjoyed the fostering aid of the Society for the Advancement of Christianity, a society which, as Plain Truth has shown, derives nine-tenths of its support from the bishop's friends. But take another instance—it is a fact capable of being proved, that a gentleman belonging to Trinity church, Southwark, has been solicited to go to the convention at Harrisburg, as a deputy from St. Matthews' church, Francisville, of which the Rev. Mr. Wiltbank is rector, provided, he would *pledge* himself to vote with the party to which Mr. Wiltbank belongs. I need not add the proposal was rejected. For the last two or three years St. Matthew's church has been on the list of beneficiaries of the society alluded to above, and the Rev. Mr. Wiltbank's name may be seen among the missionaries of that institution, on the thirtieth page of the last Annual Report.

Your allusion to Mr. Benjamin Clark, furnishes an occasion to say that he was elected a deputy to the Special Convention from one of the bishop's own churches, *after* it was well known, that as regards the candidates for the Episcopacy, he was inclined to favour the one to whom the rector, his assistants, and a majority of the vestry were opposed. Whether this fact furnishes any evidence on the part of the bishop's friends, in the united churches, to have a packed and pledged deputation to that body, any man can judge. Let the circumstance be contrasted with the well known and *provable* fact, that the vestry of St. John's church, N. L. would not appoint an aged, respectable gentleman, (one of the founders of the church) as deputy, because he would not consent to be pledged to vote for Mr. Meade. Perhaps if the minutes of that vestry were to be published, it might be seen that specific instructions were once voted to be given to the deputies, and that subsequently, the resolution to that purport was expunged from the record.

3. You assert that "Mr. Delancey is as much spoken of on one side as Messrs. Boyd or Bedell on the other, and with just as much reason." Now it happens that the difference between the two cases is just here, viz. that Mr. Boyd and Mr. Bedell have been voted for at a meeting of their friends since the Special Convention, whilst Mr. Delancey, besides being under the canonical age, which excludes him from the possibility of being a rival to any of his brethren, has only been spoken of by a few whose influence does not reach farther than mere conversation, and has never had (nor any body else on the bishop's side) a vote or a voice in his behalf, at any meeting, clerical, or lay. I do not question the right of the friends of the two former gentlemen to meet together, with a view to ascertain on whom they

should fix as a candidate for the assistant bishopric; but I must be allowed to express astonishment that a writer so deeply versed in the secrets of that party, as is "Plain Truth, Junior," should not be aware of there having been such a meeting, with such a result. Perhaps, a sudden flash of modesty surprised his mind, and misguided his pen when he wrote the above sentence—or, perhaps, he was not apprised of the extent, or the accuracy of the information of the humble individual who signs himself "Plain Truth."

4. In relation to the connexion of the bishop's friends with the Bible Society of Philadelphia, I have some tolerably stubborn facts, which you may not find it very easy to prove a "tissue of misrepresentations." In the first place, you say, "I had known that some of the signers of this circular had refused to read the annual address." Of this statement you must permit me very respectfully to remark, that, upon inquiry of those gentlemen who have signed the letter, I am authorized unequivocally to deny it, and to say, that not one of those gentlemen, clerical or lay, ever refused to read any annual address, or report, of the Bible Society of Philadelphia, of which you speak on the 16th page of your pamphlet.*

Again, you say, "I have sometimes seen at meetings of the Bible Society, that venerated man, (Bishop White,) unaccompanied by any of his *friends*, and then only surrounded by Boyd, Bedell, Allen, and such like *foes*." To this statement, the following facts shall answer: 1. That a majority of the ten gentlemen who sign the Letter, have contributed to the Bible Society of Philadelphia. 2. That one of them, Mr. Lowber, delivered a speech before that institution, in May, 1826. And, 3. That another of them, Mr. Kemper, has never been absent from the annual meeting of the Society but once (and then Mr. Lowber was present) since the year 1813; was for many years its recording secretary, and is now, and has been from 1813, a manager; has preached frequently in behalf of the institution; and had inserted in the Report of the State of the Church in Pennsylvania, made in the year 1823, to the General Convention, the following paragraph, viz. "The venerable bishop of this diocese still continues at the head of the first Bible Society ever formed in America. The annual meeting of the Convention has been altered of late, on purpose that it may not interfere with the anniversary of the Bible Society of Philadelphia." And let it be noted, too, that Mr. Kemper was patronising the Bible Society of Philadelphia, at a time when the Rev. Mr. Boyd was opposed to the institution, and when the Rev. Mr. Bedell, in another diocese, was, to say the least, not ranked among the *friends* of Bible Societies.

5. You charge "Plain Truth" with a laboured attempt to represent the gentlemen on your side "as opposed to Bishop White;" and strive

* Perhaps, this inaccurate author may refer to one of the bishop's friends declining to read the annual report of a Female Bible Association. If so, the statement is true. Whether such refusal amounts to hostility to that institution, as insinuated by "Plain Truth, Junior," let candid men say. That very report was read by a reverend gentleman, one of the bishop's warmest supporters.

to argue the point, that the bishop's opponents are as much his friends as any others. This latter proposition is rather too paradoxical for ordinary credulity. I have said, and I repeat it, the leading clergymen and laymen of the self-styled evangelical party in this diocese, are opposed to the general sentiments and policy of Bishop White. And if there were no other proof of it, the recent pamphlet of "Plain Fact" will furnish enough, even, I should imagine, to satisfy his coadjutor, "Plain Truth, junior." The bold and broad ground is there taken, not only of the entire destitution of truth and piety on the part of the bishop and his friends, but of their being *opposed* to them. But, without at present referring to the stern, harsh, and uncharitable denunciations of that pamphlet, which shall be noticed in its turn, I would ask any episcopalian of this city, who knows any thing about church affairs, whether the ten gentlemen whose names are to the Letter on which you comment, or the five who have signed your Circular, are the more friendly to the bishop? Whether the Reverend Messrs. Kemper, Montgomery, Rodney, De Lancey, and Weller, and Messrs. Binney, Ingersoll, Lowber, Wheeler, and Chapman, are not, in common estimation at least, more friendly to that right reverend Father, than the Rev. Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, and Dupuy, and Messrs. Riley and Robbins? If laudatory declamation would prove any thing on this point, there is no doubt it would have to be acknowledged that Mr. Bedell was as warmly the bishop's friend, as the author of the pamphlet on which I am commenting. But facts speak more convincingly than words on this topic. And what do they say? Who were the friends and supporters of Bishop White at the Special Convention? Who accused him of anticipated partiality? Why did the bishop cease to patronise the Recorder? Who sustain his views and policy, in reference to union with other denominations of christians? Who supported him in his views respecting the Education Society? Who penned, who signed, who distributed the Circular, describing the whole body of Dr. Wilson's friends (of whom the bishop was known to be one) as opposed to "truth and piety?" Was this an act of friendship? It grieves me to see men, who think and act towards the bishop as do the leading gentlemen on your side, so destitute of candour, as to endeavour to escape from the charge of being his opponents before the public, when in private they glory in the superior piety of their own characters, and the greater scripturalness of their religious views. You may call me Jesuit, if you please, and pronounce the statement dishonourable as you list; but that does not, and it cannot, alter the fact, that you and your friends are the opponents of Bishop White—opponents of his general views and policy. And the plain avowal of it by the author of "Plain Fact," who, without any reserve or qualification, declares the bishop and his friends to be *opposed to truth and piety*, is much more to my mind, than the attempt to laud the bishop to the public, and abuse him behind his back.

It is a very curious instance of self-deception—one that thoughtful minds would be apt to dwell upon—that the writer of "Plain Truth, junior," seeks to bring odium upon the bishop's friends for having cir-

culated Plain Truth during Passion week; when he himself must, judging from the time when his pamphlet appeared, have written it *during the same holy week*, in a frame of mind, too, I fear, very little like the composure of devotional, and even of charitable feeling. The truth is, the reason of the publication of "Plain Truth" at that particular time, was, that the "Circular" of Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, Dupuy, Riley, and Robbins, only reached the hands of the author, as he has stated, a few days before the appearance of the pamphlet—that Circular was the cause of the publication.

I come now to a short defence of the positions of the Letter of Messrs. Binney, etc. in relation to the *tendency* of the views and policy of the opponents of the bishop.

1. That Letter says, "the tendency of the views and policy of our opponents, (we judge charitably of their designs and motives) is to amalgamate episcopalians with other denominations of christians; thus laying the foundation, we think, not of harmony, but of lasting discord."

This is, what the bishop's friends have said, and this is pronounced by the meek and gentle author of "Plain Truth, junior," utterly *false* and *slandorous* in the sense, in which they who wrote it meant it: and in what sense was it meant? In the only sense in which it can fairly be taken, the amalgamation imports a union with other persuasions of christians in plans and measures connected with the advancement of religion. With the exception of the Bible Society, which has nothing to do with the present question, such unions have been again and again pronounced by Bishop White, (to whose authority "Plain Truth, junior," affects to pay so much regard, and for whom he avows so much veneration) calculated to issue not in harmony, but in discord. Against the Bible Society, not one of the friends of Bishop White has ever stirred a finger, or penned a line, however it may be attempted to excite odium against them on that ground. The great body of his supporters are the friends of that institution. It is against uniting with other denominations of christians, in schemes which go *beyond* the professed principle of the Bible society, (which is to distribute the word of God without comment) and reach to the exposition of the doctrines of the bible, on which diversity of opinions exists: it is to uniting in Tract societies, in Sunday school societies, in Missionary societies—it is to intermingling religious services in lectures, prayer meetings and conferences: it is to these measures the bishop and his friends object, as calculated in the end to produce collisions, and to break up that very harmony, which, it is supposed by some, they will subserve. It is to these measures, that the gentlemen who signed "the Letter," doubtless allude, when they speak of the tendency of the views and policy of their opponents, to produce amalgamations with other persuasions of Christians. Now that the leading gentlemen opposed to the bishop do favour such amalgamations, and wish and *design* in this way, to amalgamate episcopalians with other denominations, will not, I presume, be denied; and that they exhibit more zeal in behalf of some of these institutions, than they do in regard to

some of those of their own church, is also equally undeniable. Let it be noted, that I question not your right to pursue such a course. The point at issue, is a point of fact; whether you pursue it or not, and whether it is, or is not a leading feature of the policy of Bishop White's opponents. If it is part of the system of the gentlemen, in whose behalf you write, then it is at least probable that they design to prosecute it; and the false and slanderous charge turns out to be somewhat near the truth. To place the matter fairly before the church—the bishop and his friends pronounce of such amalgamations, that they are calculated to be subversive of the peculiarities of the episcopal church, and to produce discord, instead of that general harmony with other denominations which is desired. On the other hand, the bishop's opponents *favour* such amalgamations, (as is admitted by "Plain Truth, junior," and his coadjutor "Plain Fact,") and this is the fact which the signers of "the Letter" have stated: and which "Plain Truth," after them, has likewise announced. Is there any objection to its being known that such are your sentiments? or is it apprehended, that a bold and fearless and plain avowal of them, may wake the slumbering judgments of your fellow episcopalians throughout the state, and induce them to examine into the *tendency* of the views and practices thus maintained, to secure the peace and harmony and advancement of the church of Christ?

It will not be, at this point, irrelevant to state, what I presume neither of the rev. gentlemen *can* have any objection to be published, that the Rev. Mr. Boyd has occasionally officiated in the lecture room of Dr. Skinner and other presbyterian divines: and that the Rev. Mr. Bedell, not long since, was called upon by Miss Livermore, (a celebrated female preacher, belonging, I believe, to no particular sect,) to pray after *she* had delivered a discourse, in the presence of a considerable collection of people, at a private house: which request was complied with, and the descent of the divine blessing upon the labours of the reverend lady was implored.

It may be mentioned also as a fact, that a lay member of the late Special Convention, observed to an acquaintance, that he was opposed to Bishop White's system, of not admitting clergymen of other denominations into our pulpits, and that such a species of interchange of pulpits, was quite necessary, especially in the country.

2. Another statement of the "Letter of Messrs. Binney, etc." avows, "that the *tendency* of the views and policy of their opponents is, to overthrow the ministerial office by encouraging the ministrations of unordained men." On this point, you ask, "have they introduced any unordained men into their pulpits?" As if it were not possible to *encourage* the ministrations of unordained men, without such an introduction. Have you never heard of prayer meetings where the laity and clergy pray in turn? Do not some unordained men take part in the arrangement, by which the Sunday schools of St. Andrew's church are weekly preached to and exhorted? What says the Recorder of March 19, 1825, in giving an account of a revival in the Rev. Mr. Bull's parish? The account, it is well known, was written by the Rev. Mr. Boyd. It contains this sentence, "some of the young con-

verts were *asked* to lead in prayer, and *I* think, I never heard more importunate addresses made to the throne of grace."

The right of the laity to pray in social meetings by themselves, is not questioned—but the expediency of clergymen, laying aside the ministerial character, and calling upon laymen to lead in prayer, and to deliver expositions of scripture, the bishop and his friends may be allowed to question; because, to their view, it is sinking the clerical office, destroying the distinction between clergymen and laymen, and must issue eventually, if carried fully into operation, in overthrowing the ministerial office. That the bishop and his friends have some *authority* for maintaining such views, I cite a passage from the Ordinal in the prayer book: "and, therefore, to the intent that these orders [the ministerial] may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this church, no man shall be allowed, or taken, to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, in this church, or *suffered to execute any of the said functions*, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto." And also the thirty-third article of the church: "It is not *lawful* for any man to take upon him the office of *public preaching*, or ministering the sacraments, in the congregation, before he be *lawfully called and sent* to execute the same; and those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." These views, moreover, are not the vagaries of an alarmed imagination. They rest on experience, and they accord with the sentiments of such men as Scott the commentator, of Robinson, of Wilks the editor of the Christian Observer, of Jarratt, and of the truly evangelical Bishop Heber. Let it be noted, that these things are not objected to, as is sometimes calumniously said, because the bishop and his friends are opposed to vital piety; but, because a reference to the nature of man, to the records of experience, and to the reasonings of their own minds, convinces them, that such are not the means by which the real interests of the church of the Redeemer are to be permanently subserved. That it is the design of those, who are opposed to Bishop White, to support these views, and carry out the system, must be judged of by the fact, that these are the views, and this is the system which they uphold. That they would do it, believing that it would destroy the ministry, has neither been asserted by me, and is not fairly deducible from the position of the signers of the "Letter of Messrs. Binney," &c.

One fact, under this head, it may be well to mention—it rests on the testimony of a person, who heard the sentiment openly avowed, that a member of the late Special Convention affirmed, in language to this effect, "that for his part, he should be glad to get rid of the prayer book altogether." A somewhat similar declaration has issued from the lips of another of the party in the state, opposed to the views and policy of Bishop White.

3. A third statement of the "Letter" of Messrs. Binney, &c. says, that it is the tendency of the views and policy of their opponents to

introduce into the church "the peculiarities of Calvinism, or of Methodism." On this point, "Plain Truth, junior," has rung changes not a few. Let us see how the statement can be substantiated. The peculiarities of Calvinism are the five points—election and reprobation, limited atonement, total depravity,* irresistible grace, and final perseverance. That these doctrines are held by some of the clergy of this state, who are opposed to the views and policy of Bishop White, as the true doctrines of the gospel, will not probably be denied; that, honestly believing them to be the doctrines of the gospel, and of the church, it will be their duty, and their effort, to preach and to inculcate them, if they are honest men, no doubt is to be entertained; and that if they are preached and inculcated, they will be introduced into the church, (not into her formularies, for there they cannot enter, but into the minds of the members of the church,) is not a very unlikely supposition. Believing, therefore, the gentlemen who hold this system, or parts of it, to be honest men, and pious persons, the authors of the "Letter," so often referred to, might well infer, that, as agents were employed in the work, the Calvinistic doctrines would spread in the church; and that those views would increase in proportion to the influence, talents, zeal, and authority of those who maintain them. Believing also that this system is not the system of either the gospel, or the church, they have, without questioning the piety of those who hold it, or even naming them, avowed their opinion of the tendency in this respect of the views and policy of their opponents. As they inferred the design of the Calvinistic gentlemen to inculcate these doctrines, from the fact, that they are held by them, in charging them with that *design*, the bishop's friends have been only guilty of the desperate iniquity of believing and representing some of their brethren to be honest men, and zealous upholders of their peculiar views.

It is unnecessary to repeat these remarks in relation to the peculiarities of Methodism. But I will take the liberty of mentioning, that one (a leading one, too,) of the party opposed to Bishop White, has openly, to him, advocated the expediency and usefulness of *camp meetings*; and whether this is a peculiarity of Methodism, which it is adviseable to introduce among the members of the church, let her members themselves judge. If there are men who entertain these views in the church, and who are as honest, pious, and zealous, as the clergy with whom you act are represented to be, the infusion of their sentiments throughout the church may be certainly spoken of, I presume, without any guilt, as a matter to be apprehended, by those who do not happen to agree with them. And the fact, that such views are held, and by men of such a description, may also be communicated to the members of the church, without any great offence, provided the individuals are spoken of respectfully, as cannot be denied to be the

* The doctrine of the bishop's friends on this subject, is the doctrine of the article, that "man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil."

case in the "Letter" on which you have expended your criticisms. To this, then, amounts the grievous crime of the authors of that Letter: they have said, that there are men in the church who maintain Calvinistic or Methodistic peculiarities; that they are honest and zealous men, and will inculcate them; and that this is a ground of the opposition made to the schemes and efforts of a party, the tendency of which is to encourage and introduce such peculiarities. But to what does all this amount, compared with the charge brought by your Circular, against the bishop and his friends, of being *opposed to truth and piety*? The Letter charges a few individuals with such fondness for a system, as to desire and to design to spread it among the members of the church. The Circular broadly excludes the bishop, one half of the clergy, and a multitude of the laity, from the character of piety and truth: a position which is very coolly assumed, maintained, and urged by an author, "Plain Fact," who, having resided in this diocese not quite one year, has fulminated his excommunications against his bishop and brethren, with a melancholy degree of self-complacency and assurance.

4. Another *tendency* of the views and policy of the bishop's opponents, is asserted by Messrs. Binney, &c. to be, "to establish and cherish insubordination to episcopal authority." That such is the tendency of their views and policy, perhaps no stronger proof need be adduced, than the existing organized opposition, which is represented to be formed for the defence of truth and piety—against whom? The bishop of this diocese, supported by half his clergy. But, besides; who raised the outcry against the bishop, for doing that act which the Convention of the church itself imposed upon him, by a special resolution, in reference to the parochial reports of 1825? Let the Recorder and Mr. Boyd reply. Here was an episcopal act performed by the express vote of an ecclesiastical body; and yet it was denounced as unauthorized, and the doing of it was so spoken of, as to be calculated to produce a general persuasion in the public mind, that the bishop in this matter had lorded it over God's heritage, which imputation was allowed to remain but very equivocally contradicted for more than a year before the public. Again, read the following extract from the 33d canon:—"And in case of such vicinity of two or more churches, as that there can be no local boundaries drawn between their respective cures, it is hereby ordained, that in every such case, no minister of this church, other than the parochial clergy of the said cures, shall preach within the common limits of the same, in any other place than in one of the churches thereof, without the consent of a major number of the parochial clergy of the said churches." Now, compare with this "ecclesiastical authority" the following circumstances: that the Rev. Mr. Aydelott, in the summer of 1826, commenced preaching, morning and evening, at No. 157, North Ninth, between Race and Vine Streets, within four or five squares of St. Stephen's and St. James's churches, which are the only episcopal churches on that side of the city, without even consulting, much more obtaining the consent of, a major number of the parochial clergy of said churches, of one of which the bishop himself is rector.

Mr. Aydelott was then maintained, in part, by the Missionary Society of St. Andrew's Church, the interests of which could be but very feebly affected by this distant establishment. Had the bishop and the clergymen, whose rights were thus infringed, and whose feelings were thus disregarded, ventured to raise the arm of legitimate authority, the proceeding would probably have been denounced as a measure of high-handed and ungodly opposition to the cause of truth and piety. That an additional episcopal church was wanted at all in this city, let these unquestionable facts evince: that there are more than \$50,000 of debt now pressing down the episcopal churches within its limits and suburbs; and that plenty of space is to be found under the roofs of existing churches, to accommodate all the increase of episcopalians for some years to come. That a church was wanted to accommodate that particular part of the city, or its vicinity, let the fact of its proximity to the two churches named above, disprove; strengthened, as it is, by the additional circumstance, that a majority of the *nineteen* signers of the application for a charter for the church, are members (many of them communicants) of the several churches in the city; and none of them, it is believed, now belong to the churches of the city which are supposed to sustain the views and policy of Bishop White. Formerly, when a domestic missionary was employed, and officiated in the city and suburbs, he acted under the direction of a society, in whose concerns the bishop and all the episcopal clergy of the city had a voice.

Again, the Convention has directed that a collection should be made for the episcopal fund, and a sermon be preached on the subject of episcopacy, or some collateral subject, once every year in every established congregation.* It does not appear from the journals, that any such collection has *ever* been made in the congregation of St. Andrew's. And the facts already detailed by Plain Truth, in a former pamphlet, sufficiently show by whom this *law* has been obeyed—a law founded on *ecclesiastical authority*, the act of the Convention—and, therefore, according to your own views obligatory.

How far these circumstances go to prove the tendency of the views and policy of the bishop's opponents, to establish and cherish insubordination to episcopal or ecclesiastical authority, let others judge.

5. The last intimation given by Messrs. Binney, &c. of the *tendency* of the views and policy of their opponents, is, that they are calculated "to overthrow our unrivalled liturgy, by the introduction of extemporaneous effusions into the public services of the church."

Now, that some of the bishop's opponents do pray extemporaneously in the church after sermon, will not, I presume, be denied by any one; for if it should, whole congregations are to be referred to for the proof. And that it is the tendency of such a practice to produce the effects ascribed to it, is an opinion which I presume may be freely uttered without any great offence, when it is done with due regard to civility and propriety, as you must admit has been the case in the statement of the gentlemen on which you comment. When we speak

* See Constitution, Canons and Resolutions of the Church in this state, p. 17.

of the tendency of any policy to produce a certain effect, it must be judged of by the innate character of the policy, and by the effects it has produced. As regards the former, every thinking man is able to make up an opinion. In respect to the latter, let the facts now stated show. I have the authority of the gentlemen who heard the sentiment avowed, to state that a member of the late Special Convention said to him words to this effect:—"that for his part he should be glad to get rid of the prayer book altogether." Whether the known avowal of such a wish would not authorize the signers of the Letter to speak even of the *design* of some who are opposed to them, let the public say.

Another member of that body has likewise averred, that he was in favour of episcopal clergymen opening their pulpits to ministers of other denominations, and was opposed to the policy which forbade it. Whether such an introduction of promiscuous modes of worship in our churches would or would not comport with the preservation of the liturgy, every man is at liberty to form and to avow his opinion. Let it be noted that no clergyman has been charged (as you rather sophistically intimate) with such design. But, that some members of the party now arrayed against the bishop and his friends, entertain views and wishes which go to the overthrow of our unrivalled liturgy, besides the above stated circumstances, a greater variety of evidence might perhaps be furnished than is supposed by many to exist.

In concluding my remarks upon your pamphlet, I will take the opportunity to say, that although with an adroitness of sophistry which I aspire not to emulate, or even to follow, you have perverted the meaning of the language of "Plain Truth," no less than that of the signers of "the letter of Messrs. Binney, &c.;" yet you have met none of his facts, answered none of his arguments, and not even denied the genuineness of the circular which you have striven by recrimination to defend. If it were possible to blacken the characters of the ten gentlemen on whose Letter you comment, so as to force them from the pale of christian society, it would not aid in the slightest degree the exculpation of your friends. If their "Letter" bore precisely the same character as your "Circular," it would not lessen the heinousness, or the impropriety, or the unchristian character of the latter production. But, when the episcopalians of this diocese shall perceive, that you have failed to disprove what has been said by "Messrs. Binney, &c.," when they shall find that the only justification offered for "the Circular of Messrs. Boyd, &c." consists in maligning others: when they shall discover that sufficient evidence existed to substantiate the truth of every one of the representations of the former gentlemen, in relation to the tendency of the views and policy of their opponents; and to the designs and wishes of some of them, is there one that would not wish this page of her history could be torn from the records of the church in this diocese? And is there one who does not grieve at being constrained by such mortifying facts, to write upon it "the glory is departed?"

A Letter to "Plain Fact."

As you are the only individual who as yet has honoured the pamphlet of "Plain Truth" with any thing like an attempt at reply, I hold myself bound in courtesy to yourself, and in justice to the church, to offer some remarks upon your production; although ample apology might have been found in its abundant coarseness and personalities for treating it with contemptuous disregard. Before commencing the work, however, formally, I will assume the liberty of presenting a few general observations, in imitation of the example you have set me. Let it be understood then in the outset, by yourself, by the church, and by the christian public, that in my own behalf, and in that of the bishop and his friends, you are freely forgiven for every one of your harsh denunciations, and charges against our religious and ministerial characters. No personal feelings guided the pen which indited the pages of "Plain Truth:" no personal feelings have now renewed the employment of that pen. Though broadly pronounced to be not only negatively destitute of religion, but the positive "opposers of Truth and Piety," we have yet "learned Christ" so far as to be able to discriminate between the *persons*, and what we deem the misguided *views* of our professed brethren; and whilst we firmly and plainly unfold the latter, we shall not venture upon such an infringement of the prerogative of God as to deny the claims to christian piety, zeal, or truth of those whom prejudice, error, or ignorance may have arrayed against us.

In examining your pamphlet, I shall pursue the very simple course of exposing its inconsistencies, correcting its errors, and disproving its perverted inferences, as they present themselves to my notice in the progress of the scrutiny.

Your reasons for not answering "Plain Truth" "in his own manner and spirit" which you represent to be so agreeable to "corrupt nature," would have commanded the approval of your readers, had you not, somewhat inconsistently, in the final sentence of your appendix, declared "one can peruse 'Plain Truth' with comparative *satisfaction*, because there is *sense* and *decency* in it," and thus left your readers to infer that you were determined not to characterize *your* answer with "the *sense* and *decency*," which you allow to pervade the manner and spirit of your opponent's production. Whether the "meekness of wisdom and spirit of love," which you avow as the intended guides of your pen, are to be found in your bold denial of truth and piety to your bishop and brethren, in your heartless comparison of the bishop to "a pitiable wreck on the boisterous billows;" or in the use which you have made of his name on the 25th and 26th pages of your pamphlet, is a question which temperate men in the church

must decide for themselves, and which christian men will find it hard perhaps to reconcile with the letter or spirit of the scriptural injunction, "thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man—and fear the Lord."

Of those who sided with the bishop at the late Special Convention, and who support his general views and policy, after having represented them as opposing truth and piety, in a body, intimated that some good men might possibly be found in this worst cause, and avowed that you were conscientiously bound to resist the advocates of the bishop's system, you remark: "but with respect to them *personally*, I say nothing, I judge nothing:—I would fain cast over them that broad mantle which hath inscribed on it *charity hopeth all things*."* Now, any man who reads your pamphlet would find it difficult to discover, whether this broad mantle has covered the person of any one individual of your opponents against whom your pen has been turned. It has not reached the person of "Plain Truth"—it has not reached the "Episcopalian," whom you denominate "a hollow hearted sycophant."† It has not reached the person of the reverend gentleman whom you designate the "raging rector,"‡ or that of the respectable layman whom you sneeringly denominate "the little lawyer." In short, whether there is a single individual out of the circle of your friends who has been treated with the ordinary decency, (not charity or courtesy,) which even respect to the public might seem to require in a controversy on church matters, at the hands of one who professes such a deep love of the gospel, and such an exclusive superiority as to christian character, and evangelical piety, is a question which those who read through your pamphlet can easily answer. It must be admitted that if there be "sense and decency" in the production of "Plain Truth," you have most successfully accomplished your design "to *avoid* his manner and spirit."

"Of all men living," (says "Plain Fact") "I believe the case of the partisan in religion, whether he be contending for or against 'the truth as it is in Jesus'—the case of the partisan is the most hopeless."§ It almost makes me shudder at the self-delusion of the man who could pen such a sentence as a preface to such a pamphlet as has been sent forth to be public, under the signature of "Plain Fact," every page of which breathes the exclusive, heated and intolerant spirit of a bigoted devotee to his own views and system, and which, throughout, pronounces a sweeping excommunication from the pale of godliness, not of this individual or that, but of every soul of those who do not coincide with him in religious sentiment, or walk with him in ecclesiastical policy. To what lengths the possession of *power* would carry such an individual, God only knows. But whether the exhibition of such a spirit as this production displays, does not verify the assertion of "Plain Truth," "that there is a spirit abroad in our church, not the pure, quiet and humble spirit of religion for which we should pray, and in the signs of which we should

* P. F. p. 5.

† See appendix to P. F.

- P. F. p. 27.

§ P. F. p. 4.

rejoice, but one of a dark, and boding character,"* let every man determine who reads this pamphlet of "Plain Fact." Perhaps nothing has ever appeared in the Episcopal church throughout the country—certainly nothing ever before appeared in this diocese—bearing a character, and breathing a spirit so radically subversive of all our institutions, and so powerfully calculated to rouse men from apathy to exertion, from indifference to zeal, or from the quiet delusion that all is right to some adequate inquiry into the real state of things in the church; as this answer to the "Candid Address." If our brethren on the other side do indeed, (which I can hardly believe,) adopt and cherish the feelings against us, or maintain and inculcate the sentiments, herein manifested and avowed, most fervently but humbly would we adopt the language of our master, and say, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." But I proceed to the examination of the contents of the pamphlet of "Plain Fact."

I shall notice those facts published by me, which are admitted, or at least have not been denied by this author, and briefly reply to his perversions of them.

1. It is admitted by Plain Fact, that there is an organized party in this state, hostile to the opinions and policy of Bishop White, who consult together, act together, and vote only *for* their friends, and *against* their opposers;† and who consider the whole body of the bishop's friends as "opposers to truth and piety." This is admitted, justified, and gloried in.‡

2. "Plain Fact" says that the friends of Mr. Meade, at the late Special Convention, "held public meetings in a public place—the doors being constantly open, and every one who chose was at liberty to attend;"§ and that at these meetings "their resolutions were adopted unanimously," and in the Convention were "faithfully adhered to."

Now, that every one who chose was at liberty to attend these meetings, "held once or twice daily during the Convention," my readers will find it difficult to reconcile with the following facts which can be proved.—1. That a deputy from Christ Church, Reading, was invited to attend one of those meetings held in the Rev. Mr. Bedell's lecture room; and when he came near the church, he was told by the person who invited him, (a member of the Convention,)

* P. T. p. 3.

† In a note on p. 5. of his pamphlet, Plain Fact asks "whom did high churchmen," (meaning the supporters of Bishop White,) "remove from office at the Convention at Lancaster, in 1823?" I answer, the Rev. Mr. Boyd was then removed from the deputation to the General Convention, and for two reasons:—1st, Mr. Boyd was *not* at the Convention: and 2nd, Because Dr. Abercrombie, who *was* at the Convention, had been left off the deputation in the previous Convention of 1822, to make room for Mr. Boyd. These changes, however, did not originate in any party feeling, or from any party combination by the bishop's friends. They were purely accidental. Not so the case at Norristown, where, previously—written tickets were handed about, and the machinery of electioneering first put in motion by the opponents of Bishop White, upon their unsuspecting brethren.

‡ P. F. p. 6.

§ P. 6.

that before he could go in, he must promise not to divulge any thing that was said or done there ; and that upon his refusing to make such promise, he was not allowed to enter.----2. Another gentlemen, a member of the Convention, has said that he attended one meeting ; but finding that they were intended to be *secret* meetings, he would not go again.—3. A third gentleman, a member of the Convention, went to the place where one of these meetings was held. The door-keeper refused to admit him. His own rector was called out of the room, and told him that he could not be admitted, because he belonged to the other party. Now, these are indisputable facts, for which the personal testimony of these gentlemen is within my reach. That the resolutions passed at these meetings had reference to the proceedings of the Convention, according to the statement of “ Plain Truth,” is here boldly avowed and gloried in by “ Plain Fact.” The justification set up is, that the friends of Dr. Wilson held private meetings in private places, to promote the election of their candidate. Now, so far as Dr. Wilson’s friends are concerned in this charge, the plain truth is, that a small number of them met twice during the Convention upon invitation, with a view of introducing the members to a knowledge of each other at the house of a private gentleman ; at which meetings there was nothing like organization---no chairman---no secretary---no formal adoption of resolutions---nothing more than a general interchange of opinion upon the objects and proceedings of the Convention---no binding or pledging, or injunction of secrecy : at which the gentlemen were coming in and going out at all times of the evening ; at both which meetings there were present gentlemen on both sides of the question ; and of which meetings many gentlemen who voted with the bishop’s friends at the Special Convention, will find what I have now written the very first account of them they ever heard.

Now, let the public say how this compares with meetings held *once or twice a day*, for which an initiatory pledge of secrecy was required ; and at which such resolutions were unanimously adopted, to guide the proceedings of those who composed them in the Convention as did produce that result. The confession of “ Plain Fact” on this point, enables us to understand what appeared when it was uttered---a somewhat unintelligible observation of Mr. De Pui, in the Convention, who remarked in a laconic reply to some gentlemen arguing a point before that body, in words to this effect :—“ It is of no use to discuss the subject, the minds of a majority of this Convention are made up about it.” Had the reverend gentleman who asked if Mr. De Pui was endued with the attribute of omniscience to enable him to say so, known of the previous *resolutions unanimously adopted* in Mr. Bedell’s lecture room, he might have spared the question. As to the charge of some of our delegates being *pledged* to vote against Mr. Meade, which is asserted on p. 7. of “ Plain Fact’s” pamphlet, the only instances in which this *general* charge can be reduced to an individual application, are in reference to a delegate from St. Stephen’s Church in this city, by whom, as shown on a former page, I am au-

thorized to pronounce it totally without foundation ; and in the case of the delegates from the churches at Norristown and Perkiomen, in regard to whom, I am also authorized to give a positive denial to your statement.

3. It is admitted, that episcopal societies have been established, a missionary employed, and a church organized in the city of Philadelphia, in the way stated by " Plain Truth." And the justification proposed is, that none of these things prove on the part of those who originated them, any indisposition to submit to the ecclesiastical control established by the church, though it is not denied, that (as asserted by me,) they evince a proneness to act independently of, or in opposition to the bishop.

Let it be observed, that it is not denied, that the societies here referred to, are entirely independent of the ecclesiastical Head of the church in this diocese, and that he has no connexion with them, direct or remote. What are these societies? An education society, and a missionary society. The first is a general society, not even limited to the diocese, and was formed in opposition to the views of the bishop.* The second is an Association of some zealous and active ladies of St. Andrew's, which was originally auxiliary to the Society for the advancement of christianity, of which Bishop White is president, but was subsequently withdrawn from that connexion, and rendered independent of all influence, but that of the Rev. Rector of St. Andrew's. Its work has been to locate and support a zealous missionary, who has organized a church, and purchased a place of worship in a quarter of the city where the necessities of the episcopalians did not require it, and where the establishment must, for a time at least, interfere with the success, not of the church or its patrons, but of those which are under the pastoral control of others. Had the society for the advancement of christianity, established an active and popular minister in the neighbourhood of St. Andrew's, and purchased the Musical Fund Hall, which stands in its rear, and converted it into a church, I presume it would be considered as something like an infringement on the permanent interests of that congregation, and something like an invasion of the rights and feelings of its rector. Now, whether the establishment of these institutions shows a proneness to act independently of the bishop, I leave those who read these remarks to judge ; and, whether a canon has not been violated in the proceedings of the missionary, may be seen by turning to the 29th page of this pamphlet, where its provisions are quoted.

4. Again ; it is not denied, that Mr. M'Elroy purchased a pew in the church which he represented, *after* the certificate of his appointment was made out, and that he had not previously been a worshipper in it for many years. Here you tell me, that the sending of this gentleman to Convention, was not the *act* of the *whole* party. True—but did not a leader, (Mr. De Pui,) of the party, move that thi deputy, with others, should be admitted into the Convention, without

* See Philadelphia Recorder, June, 1826.

any formal inquiry into the facts connected with his claim to a seat, which had been questioned? Did not the majority of the Convention, (all your party,) pass a vote, to postpone a resolution to obtain the facts of his case, and of that of others, in order that the resolution of Mr. De Pui, which went to admit those of your friends only, who had been objected to, might be introduced? Any man who was present at the Convention, and will read the record of its proceedings on pages 16-17, will be convinced, that the whole party were implicated in this attempt, to introduce into that body a gentleman, who had no more constitutional right to represent the church of Bristol, *when he was appointed*, than either you or I. Had he not rented, or purchased a pew as he did, on the *2d day* of the meeting of the Convention, he could not constitutionally have taken a seat: late as it was done, that act brought him within the requisition of the constitution, and was the ground of his subsequent admission, and of the withdrawal of the objections to him.

5. Again; it is not denied by you, that congregations were organized between the date of the call of the Special Convention, and the time of its meeting, and an attempt made to introduce them into the Convention. You say, however, that I cannot prove that they were not organized to promote the glory of God and the good of souls, but to serve party purposes. I have *not asserted*, that they were organized with these sinister views, nor could the fact be proved without claiming to know the hearts of men, to which I do not pretend. Read *my* remark under this head—"whether those churches had been organized with a view to party purposes, or with a single eye to the glory of God and the good of souls, is a question that can more readily be answered by those who urged and effected their organization than by me, and the public decision of which must be left to that day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed."* You will say, that this language amounts to an insinuation on the subject. Look then at the *time* when these churches were organized—at the *fact* stated by Mr. Robbins in the Convention, that *he had visited* some of them during the summer (within that time)—and to the circumstance, that delegates from those new congregations *were on the ground, ready to take their seats* in the Convention—and you must be a sturdier and more determined queller of suspicions than most men, if you continue to declare the intimation given, has not a *shadow* of proof to support it. The substance of proof, we cannot have, but the shadow, (and I fear, most persons will pronounce it a dark one too,) is plainly before our eyes.

6. The publication of the Rev. Mr. Meade's sermon is the next point. This fact, too, is not denied, nor even the truth of the anecdote connected with it questioned. The justification is, that it was the *last* sermon Mr. Meade had sent to the press, and that the design was, "in order that every one might see and judge for himself, with respect to the merits of the man."† The fact of the publication being authorized by the party you uphold, is the main point between you

* Can. Ad. p. 7.

† Plain Fact, p. 8.

and me. This you admit. As to the *intention* in publishing it, I leave individuals to make up their own minds, whether to agree in opinion with you, or with your former candidate, Mr. Meade. Of this I am persuaded, that had Mr. M. been consulted on the propriety of the proceeding, he would have reprobated and prevented it.

7. I come now to the seventh particular, noted in your pamphlet as one of my assertions, viz. that the opponents of the bishop created a fund, to defray the expenses of delegates who came down from the country, and voted with them. **THIS FACT IS NOT DENIED:** it is broadly admitted. Let us examine your mode of defending it. It is two-fold—first, by vindicating the propriety of the measure; and, secondly, by accusing the friends of the bishop of doing the same thing. I shall invert the order of these statements in my remarks upon them.

You assert, then, that the bishop's friends "did the same thing themselves," i. e. that they said to their friends throughout the state, if you have not the means of paying your own expenses to the Convention, we will do it for you; that they, too, have established a "fund," a "consecrated treasury," for this purpose. The charge brought against the bishop's friends, speaking of them as a body, is, *that they created a fund, and offered to pay, and did pay, the expenses of delegates who came down from the country and voted for them.* Let there be no evasion here. This is what has been charged upon the bishop's opponents, as a body, and is admitted to be *true* as regards them. And this is what you now charge upon the bishop's friends, as a body, in saying, that they "did the very *same* thing themselves." Let it be noted, that this is not a charge brought against one individual, or even two, or even three; but a charge made against the supporters of the bishop, in precisely the *same sense* in which it was made against, and is admitted by, his opponents. To this charge, then, which you state to be a *fact*, I am authorized to, and I do, reply, that IT IS UTTERLY UNFOUNDED. No such fund was ever raised for such a purpose. No individual was ever authorized to make to any man any such offer, in behalf of the bishop's friends as a body, or any collection of them. You are boldly challenged to a proof of your assertion.

So much, then, for this method of justification—let us turn to the other. I give it in your own language.

"Every one who has seriously observed the progress of 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' knows that it is chiefly among the *poor* that the Lord has his people; and no churchman ought to be ignorant, that among us, these poorer members have exactly the same rights with the *rich*. Now, here is the offence of some of the supporters of evangelical religion—they said to their friends throughout the state, if there are any of you who desire (and are or shall be regularly appointed) to come to the next Convention, to exert that influence in the solemn matter to be there acted upon, and in which we are all concerned; and if you have not the means of paying your own expenses to the Convention, for the exercise of that right which both the Bible and the canons of the church give you, then we, whom Providence has more abundantly favoured in temporal things, 'will be at charges for you.' Whether this be a deed to be blown about from mouth to

mouth, with all the exaggeration of affected horror—or a most noble act of gospel charity, I leave it to christians to judge. My own heart, I freely confess, is warmed at the bare recital of it; and this I can say without ostentation, because I contributed not one cent to the fund—God having pleased to dispose my lot among the poor—though not so poor was I, as to be compelled to draw on this *consecrated treasury*.”*

On this point, I propose to pen a few observations, that it may be fairly and broadly viewed. In the first place, then, I would have my readers observe, that, as regards some of the delegates who voted with the party opposed to the bishop at the late Special Convention, *they had their expenses paid*. When I penned this statement in the “Candid Address,” I had satisfactory evidence of its truth. That evidence need not now be produced. The fact is here *publicly admitted*. So far as the Convention at Harrisburg is concerned, the “Circular” signed by Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, Dupuy, Riley, and Robbins, the genuineness of which is admitted by Plain Fact, constitutes the proof, that an offer of money to pay expenses, has, in relation to *its* members, been made. Let it be observed, too, that the offer made by the bishop’s opponents was an exclusive offer—made “to *their* friends throughout the state.” The reader will note, likewise, that this offer was made *before* these friends were appointed deputies—“if any of you who desire (and are or *shall be* appointed) to come to the next Convention,” &c. Whether the offer made to the deputies of the Special Convention, was made by the gentlemen who signed the Circular, which contains the offer in relation to the approaching Convention at Harrisburg, or not, does not appear. You may note, too, that this money is expressly called a “consecrated treasury,” a “fund.” Of course, to be “at charges,” is an expression to be understood as importing, not merely the exercise of hospitality, but the payment of money. Now, divest this transaction of the colouring and garb which has been thrown around it by Plain Fact, and which, doubtless, is the light in which those who have received and profited by this offer have been made to view it; and let it stand forth broadly to the eye of any calm and dispassionate man, and what *would* he, or *could* he say of it, as regards its claims to being consistent with the purity and the integrity which the gospel exacts from men professing its faith, and its principles? I need not repeat the observations which were offered on this point in the “Candid Address.” I need not state the distinctions between this transaction and that of an individual, or the Convention, or a vestry, paying the expenses of deputies. It is true, that the poor and the rich stand on the same footing in our church. The fact, that some of the deputies are poor, and therefore require this assistance, would be a good reason for the vestry, or the Convention, making up a fund to assist them; but I cannot see how it affords any justification for an organized body, totally independent of the several vestries, and the Convention—a body unknown to the constitution and canons—a body operating *secretly*, and stretching its

* Plain Fact, p. 9.

powerful arms from one end of the state to the other—I cannot see how such a body of men is to be justified in raising a fund, and paying deputies, in the way adopted by the association, of which Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, Dupuy, Riley, and Robbins, are now the Committee of Correspondence—a way which must necessarily, and is expected to, have an influence upon their votes and views. The same reasons which are said to have called this body into being, (the defence of piety and truth,) will, of course, be conceived to demand its continuance; and the church in this diocese has before it the terrible prospect of the perpetuity of a convention *within* a convention, a church *within* a church. Let me entreat the reader to look, too, at the attitude which such a transaction would assume in a political point of view.

Suppose the governor of Pennsylvania were elected by the legislature of the state; and the members, thereof, instead of being paid as at present by the state, were at *personal charges* for travelling and board, &c.—Suppose a party determined to elevate a particular individual to the gubernatorial chair, in order to which, it would be necessary to secure a *majority* in the legislature on *their side*.—Suppose, for this purpose, a number of monied individuals make up a fund for the payment of the expenses of such members of the legislature as will *pledge themselves* to vote for their candidate.—Suppose that these gentlemen address a *Confidential Circular* to their friends throughout the state, developing the principles and aims of the party, and in order to obviate the objections of *expense*, on the part of their representatives, assurance is given that the “Expense Fund” will be available for all those who will agree in principle, and act in concert with the persons signing the Circular—Suppose, moreover, that it were “chiefly among the *poor*,” that this party had their adherents, and they were to say to any representative from a distant county—come to the next legislature, to exert your influence in the solemn matter to be there acted upon, and in which we are all equally concerned, and if you have not means of paying your own expenses to Harrisburg, for the exercise of that right which both God and the constitution of the state give you, then we, whom Providence has more abundantly favoured in temporal things; “will be at charges for you.” Suppose all this and then answer the following questions—

First—Would not the offer of the party alluded to, to be “*at charges*” for their “*poorer brethren*” amount in law as well as in morals, to an offer to *bribe*—and would it not savour of the *spirit of bribery*?

Second—Would not those, who on account of their poverty, were compelled to draw on this “consecrated treasury” implicate themselves in the crime of taking a *bribe*?

Upon the answers which my readers shall give to these questions will depend their views of the analogous transaction in our church, which is recorded on these pages, and gloried in by one of its defenders and promoters as a “most noble act of Gospel Charity.” That this species of charity may never again darken the pages of the history of this church; and never again rest upon the characters of christian men, and christian ministers, is a wish which I feel assured will be re-echoed from every section of our community.

8. But I proceed to another statement made by me, and not denied by "Plain Fact"—That the opponents of the bishop encouraged the Rev. Mr. Nash, a missionary at Green Bay, to remain and claim his seat in the Convention, to the manifest detriment, and almost total ruin of the mission.*

The statement covers two points—that Mr. Nash was encouraged to remain.—This is admitted by you. That his remaining was detrimental and almost ruinous to his mission—This is not denied. Had it been, the records of the institution would have been adduced to prove it. That those of the bishop's friends who belonged to the executive committee of the General Missionary Society, urged Mr. Nash's return to Green Bay, is an unquestionable fact; that it was their duty so to do, there being no reason for his stay, is equally true; and the present state of the mission is a proof that their views that his stay would be injurious to it were well founded: but that they "ever threatened to impeach his moral character if he claimed his seat" in the Convention, has nothing to sustain it but your bare assertion.

9. Again; The facts collected from the journals and other public documents in relation to the contributions to the Episcopal Fund, &c. are not denied. The explanation of the backwardness of those whom you style the friends of evangelical religion to support these institutions is intimated to be, that these institutions are not "really calculated, and the best calculated, to promote the genuine interests of the christian church." And you give your individual opinion in respect to the bishop's fund in the following words: "*I fear that every cent bestowed in this way will be found in the end injurious to the cause of gospel piety.*"† It is to be hoped, however, notwithstanding this opinion, that as the Convention has legislated‡ on this subject, and enjoined that sermons be preached and collections be made annually in its behalf, you will so far yield to the authority of law as to comply with its directions. Funds for this object exist in most dioceses, and wiser heads than either yours or mine can see in them no ground for the apprehension that they will lead, either in this diocese or elsewhere, as you seem to believe, to "an aristocratical establishment."

If the fact that the Society for the advancement of christianity was founded by, and is now under the control of, the bishop's friends, be a solid reason for your friends not being profuse in their donations to it, I should imagine it would be an equally powerfully one against their deriving any benefit from its funds. How comes it then that whilst they withhold the one, no hesitation is evinced to employ the other? A majority of its missionaries have been for the last three years arrayed against the bishop and his friends.

10. Upon the subject of amalgamations with other denominations of christians, I must refer you to the previous pages of this pamphlet; remarking only to the reader as I pass on, that nothing on this point

* P. F. p. 10.

† Ibid. p. 11.

‡ Constitution, Canons, &c. of the Church in Pennsylvania, p. 17.

asserted by "Plain Truth" has been denied,* and calling his attention to the curious circumstance, that many of the warmest advocates for such amalgamations, are, like "Plain Fact," accustomed to be enrobed in a cloak of charity which is often affectionately thrown over the indiscriminate mass of other denominations, whilst not even a rag or corner of the mantle will be spared to their brethren within the church.

In disproof of what is said by you on page 12, about denouncing the ministry of other persuasions of christians, and to show how utterly without authority is this attempt to excite odium against the bishop and his friends, I boldly challenge you to produce a single paragraph from the writings of any of them in which such denunciations are to be found. The universal respect, and veneration entertained for the bishop by individuals of every denomination, will be adequate to shield him from the obviously intended effect of this shaft of your hostility. The truth is that the vast body of the bishop's friends in this diocese, as is well known, maintain views opposite to these. Whether you referred to this point solely to have an opportunity of levelling a blow at a distant prelate, (to whose writings it appears† you have not done justice,) or whether the reference was made to curry favour and to procure some countenance for a desperate cause with persons out of the church, I leave others to judge.

11. Again; it is not denied that the bishop's friends hold and preach the views and doctrines detailed and quoted from the articles, &c. on the 10th and 11th pages of "the Candid Address."—You charge them however with doing it seldom, and avow in reference to the party whom you labour to defend—"The faithful preaching and maintenance of these truly scriptural articles by evangelical men is the GRAND CAUSE of the opposition to them." Whether this be a true account of the grounds of the opposition to the bishop's opponents in this diocese, let those judge who have read the undisproved statements of the "Candid Address."

12. I come now to your admission that the friends of the Rev. Mr. Meade did refuse to postpone the election of a bishop during Bishop White's life. The fact, it may be noted, is acknowledged—That my readers may have an account of this affair from the parties concerned, I have placed in opposite columns the history of it by "Messrs. Binney, &c." on one side, and by "Plain Fact" on the other.

* In reply to your long note on page 12, I have only to say that when you have adduced some evidence that the friends of Bishop White maintain the sentiments there ascribed to them, it will be time enough to supply a defence. In the interim your readers may judge of your candour, when you go *out* of the diocese, in order to cull materials for an attack upon those whom you never could have heard avow, or preach the views attributed to them; and of the desperation of a cause which requires to be supported by such means. Whether you have done Bishop Hobart justice in your quotations, I have not the means of ascertaining.

† See Church Register for April 28th, 1827.

"Plain Fact," states—"the friends of truth and piety" are [accused of being] guilty of refusing, since the Convention, to put off the election during the present bishop's life.

Most certainly they did, and marvellous indeed must be his subtlety, who can construe this into a crime. For what was it but the fair exercise of that judgment, and determination of personal conduct to which every citizen of this free country is fully entitled?—But let us look at the Plain Facts of the case.

The opposers of the Evangelical people of the church in this diocese, without ever consulting them, or so much as hinting it to them, called a Special Convention for the purpose, (if it was deemed expedient,) of electing an Assistant Bishop; they chose their man among themselves, and came to the Convention fully prepared to support him. There, however, He who overruleth all things to his own glory, defeated their attempt.

The Letter of "Messrs. Binney, &c." states—"during the session of the late General Convention in Philadelphia, the Rev. Mr. Meade of Virginia, proposed to the Rev. Messrs. Montgomery, Kemper and De Lancey, and to H. Binney, Esq. in separate conversations with each of those gentlemen, that in order to allay the existing irritation in the public mind growing out of the recent attempt and failure to elect an Assistant Bishop, and if possible to restore harmony and peace, some effort should be made by mutual agreement on both sides to put the subject of an election at rest during Bishop White's life; Mr. Meade stated that he had spoken to the Rev. Messrs. Boyd, Bedell and Allen, and that they individually had acceded to the expediency of such a measure. Mr. Meade was asked, whether his friends would pledge themselves to such a course. His reply was that he thought they would, and if they refused to do so he would withdraw from being their candidate. Upon the proposal of Mr. Meade, a meeting of a few gentlemen on each side was held at the house of the Right Rev. Bishop White in the presence of the bishop and Mr. Meade. The Rev. Dr. Wilson was not in the city, or he would have been invited to be present. The Rev. Messrs. Kemper and De Lancey and H. Binney, Esq. on one side, and the Rev. Messrs. Boyd and Bedell and Mr. S. J. Robbins on the other, were present. At this meeting, it was *unanimously* resolved, to be expedient to put the question contained in the circular you received, to the clergy and laymen of the diocese: the gentlemen present, undertaking to ascertain the views of their friends respectively on the point. It was agreed to meet again at the house of the bishop, to report the result, and to take whatever other measures might be necessary, on the 18th of December. On that day, this second meeting was held accordingly; there were present, the Right Rev. Bishop White, the Rev. Messrs. Kemper, De Lancey and H. Binney, Esq. on the one side, and the Rev. Mr. Boyd and Mr. S. J. Robbins on the other. The Rev. Mr. Bedell

Thus discomfited, they turn about to those whom they had hitherto been so determinately opposing, and before whom they were then prostrate, and ask of them to pledge themselves not to use the advantage which providence had given them! Wonderful proof of a meek, forbearing, and pacific disposition, to seek to *bind* those whom they *could not beat*! And, O, obstinate Evangelicals, after being so heartily kicked and cuffed, still to refuse to bow down your necks to the yoke!"*

was not present, owing it was said by Mr. Robbins, to an engagement.

On *our* side, we were prepared to report the names of a large majority of our friends as ready to pledge themselves in favour of a postponement of the election. On *their* side, both Mr. Boyd and Mr. Robbins, stated, that as they had received but a few answers to the circulars which they had sent out, they were not prepared to speak *definitively* upon the point; at the same time, they stated, that as far as they had been able to learn the opinions of their friends, a majority of them were against the postponement, and it was their firm opinion, that a majority of their friends throughout the diocese would not consent to the measure. In a spirit of conciliation, we proposed to hold ourselves ready to meet them again upon the subject, at any period before the 1st January, ensuing, should they receive in the mean time any further intelligence of a more favourable kind from their friends. To this they consented, expressing at the same time a conviction that no such intelligence would arrive. The time expired, and we were not asked to meet them again. Thus the bright prospect of at least a temporary peace has passed away, and *they* have failed to accede to a proposition for peace and harmony, originating with their own candidate."†

13. In relation to "the Circular" published by me, and ascribed to Messrs. Boyd, Bedell, &c. you, *admit it to be genuine*.‡ The Circular is not a fiction—it was REALLY SIGNED, SANCTIONED, AND CIRCULATED BY THOSE FIVE GENTLEMEN.

Now, what is the defence? Those five gentlemen were a committee *unanimously* appointed by a majority of the Special Convention, in a public place.§ How *public* this meeting was, may be seen by a reference to a former page of this pamphlet, where it is shown that gentlemen were refused|| admittance to similar meetings of the same party. Besides, if this were a *public* meeting, why did the committee write CONFIDENTIAL on their circulars? Again, the committee you say, in justification of them, sent information, and offered counsel to their *constituents only*. Now, it is a fact which I have in my power the means of substantiating, that this "confidential Circular" was sent in several instances to individuals who

* P. F. p. 14.

† P. F. p. 15

‡ P. T. Junior, p. 4.

§ P. F. p. 16.

|| See p. 35.

were *not* their constituents, and had no more to do with their appointment than the author of "Plain Truth." Besides, if they were an authorized committee, does that circumstance justify the *contents* of the confidential circular? The bare sending of that circular, is but slight matter compared with what the committee have taken upon themselves to say in it; and both you and they may be assured, that if the author of the "Candid Address" had barely published "the Circular," without prefacing it with any facts, or attaching to it any comments, the public reprobation of that unholy document would not have been one iota less strongly marked. "That Circular is enough!" "that Circular is enough!" has burst from the lips of multitudes, and reverberated from one end of the church to the other—not "blown about with affected horror," but with real humiliation. "If thy friends Boyd and Bedell cannot get their names from that Circular—if they cannot prove that that Circular is not their's—thy friends need not undertake to answer Plain Truth," said a respectable "Friend," in reply to an attempted defence of the committee.

14. But to proceed. The attempt of Mr. Bedell and Mr. Boyd, to introduce the coloured clergyman into the Convention, is not denied; and the subsequent proceeding of the former to have his resolution expunged, is also admitted.

The turn you attempt to give to this transaction, is, that Mr. Ward, (the coloured clergyman,) had a constitutional right to a seat in the Convention. If he had at the Special Convention a right to a seat, when his vote would have *decided the question* of the election, so also had he a right to a seat in the Convention at Reading, when it was entirely an unimportant matter whether he voted or not; and the same abstract justice would seem to have required an effort at that time, to vindicate his claims to membership. Besides, the question of his right was not the question between you and me. The fact that the attempt was made, and the circumstances under which it was made, were the points at issue. This fact, and these circumstances, are undeniable: and though I should cordially admit that Mr. Bedell knew nothing as to which way Mr. Ward would vote, nor even Mr. Boyd, (though I believe *he* did not assert that he was ignorant of the point,) yet I put it to any man acquainted with the circumstances of the case, to say whether there was not sufficient ground to believe that if not an actual knowledge, yet some high expectations as to his voting in a particular way, were *somewhere* indulged.

You introduce the standing committee as saying, "we stipulated with Mr. Ward, when he was before us as a candidate for orders, that he was not to have a seat in the Convention."* And you ask who gave them right to do so? This is one of the most curious instances of ignorance or designed misrepresentation that occurs in your pamphlet. The standing committee, (of which at that time Mr. Boyd and Mr. Bedell were both members,) have never asserted nor pretended that *they* made any such stipulation with Mr. Ward; and it may therefore,

* P. F. p. 21.

with great truth, be "*solemnly, indignantly, and repeatedly denied.*" What was avowed by some of the clerical gentlemen who opposed Mr. Ward's introduction into the Convention, was that they had favoured his admission to the ministry, under the impression that he would stand, as regards the Convention, on precisely the same footing as that on which a former respectable coloured clergyman of the church had been placed, to whom the 6th regulation of the church, quoted below,* in a note, relates. And this was stated to be the impression of the bishop himself. It ought to be remarked, that on whichever side Mr. Ward might have voted, whether for Dr. Wilson, or Mr. Meade, his vote would have decided the election. The friends of the former gentleman, had no desire to secure his nomination by an agency of so questionable a nature. The whole subject, however, is before the public, which will doubtless do justice in its opinions to all the parties concerned.

15. The case of the Rev. Mr. Ridgely, is next to be noticed. I had intimated of this reverend gentleman, that he was the author of a Circular signed "Hooker;" and that the only excuse to be made for him for penning that publication, was, that he was young, had been but a short time in orders, and had resided as a clergyman in this diocese but a month. That Mr. Ridgely was the author of Hooker, you do not deny; for it is possible that this may be the case, though *you* may never have heard it ascribed to him. When Mr. R. shall himself deny, or authorize you to deny that he was the author of that circular, it will be in time to state the reasons, in addition to the current report, on which the intimation was founded, and to offer an apology if I have been in error. If Mr. R. is twenty-eight years of age, perhaps I made a mistake in representing him as young, but I fear the discovery of the error will not strengthen the apology I ventured to offer on that ground for his production. That he left the state soon after his ordination, I asserted on the authority of the Journal;† and the fact of his return to the diocese a month before the Convention, rests upon his own asseveration. Unbiased readers will perceive, that on p. 5. of the "Candid Address," I was referring not to his ecclesiastical residence, but to the time of his *actual presence* within the limits of the state.

Your account of the attempt to organize a congregation at Frankford, by this reverend brother, is not altogether accordant to facts. The following is the history of the affair, furnished with permission to publish it in the cause of truth, by the reverend clergyman within whose parish Frankford stands.

"Mr. Ridgely, I suppose, had been solicited by a family removed to Frankford, from Mr. Bedell's church in the city; for I know of no

* Regulation 6. "It is hereby declared, that the African Church of St. Thomas in the city of Philadelphia, is not entitled to send a clergyman or deputies to the Convention, or to interfere with the general government of the Episcopal Church; this condition being made in consideration of their peculiar circumstances at present." Constitution, Canons, &c. p. 16.

† See Journal of Special Convention, at page 10.

other "persons" who could have made the request to preach for them in that place; holding forth, as I should judge from his own conversation with me, the great probability of success, if proper measures were adopted, for organizing a church in that borough. Be this as it may, having preached there in the afternoon, for perhaps the second time, and I believe having given promises for the continuation of the appointment, he waited on me in the evening, and tarried all night with me. In the course of our conversation, he wished to know what I thought of the expediency of organizing a congregation at Frankford; but, as I was not aware of his having an idea of an organization unconnected with the parish, I paid but little attention to the inquiry. It was only after morning service on the same day, that I heard any thing of his having officiated at Frankford, and then, not in a way to make me suspicious of his design, nor am I sensible of having felt or expressed any thing like "dislike" on the occasion. The inquiry having been repeated in the morning, with apparent interest, I found it proper to pay particular attention to it, and informed the reverend gentleman, that it had long been my private personal opinion that we ought to have morning service in our present churches, and afternoon service in the villages of Holmesburg and Frankford, alternately—that I had repeatedly proposed it to our united vestry, but that as yet they had not acceded to the measure—that I was not without hope, that finally they would adopt my plan, for on the very day before it had been talked of by two of our officers, who concluded that it would be proper to take it into more serious consideration. He maintained that our officers had nothing at all to do with it; that the Frankford people had a right to do as they pleased upon the occasion. I reminded him that Frankford unquestionably belonged to our parish—that all our united vestry, consisting of twelve, I was confident had so considered it—that it was within walking distance of the church, being but from two to three miles from it, and that our principal warden dwelt in it. He maintained that we had no parochial bounds in this country; and that neither myself, nor officers, and indeed no other person had any right to speak "officially" on the subject—that if the Frankford people wished the measure, it was for them to decide. I informed him that we had had but two families in Frankford, belonging to our church, counting old Mr. Duffield and sons, but for one, and that one of them was now extinct; and that instead of wishing any thing of the kind, *they doubted* its expediency. That, at present, I had understood, there was a family from the city residing in the place, but as to their desires I know not. That our officers were well acquainted with the various circumstances connected with our parochial concerns, and that I had felt disposed to abide by their decision; and, that although our parish boundaries were not, perhaps, as well defined as in the old country, still we had our probable boundaries; and that the canon of our church, on the occasion, had made adequate provision accordingly—on which I read him over our 33d canon. He maintained that the meaning was different from what I alleged. I proposed to submit to

the decision of the bishop. He alleged that the bishop was not the proper person to decide, but the Convention. I maintained that independently of this, the measure in itself was improper; and, that instead of being beneficial, would be injurious. He wished to know if we did give Frankford regular service, whether we would organize a church there regularly, so that it should have its own proper officers? I replied in the affirmative. He then observed, that that was what he wished; for that it was *his desire to organize congregations not only at Frankford, but in as many places as possible round about the city, for the purpose of bringing as many delegates as he could upon the next Convention floor.* I expressed my shame and sorrow that gentlemen should avow such sentiments; and that I had felt mortified at some things which I had witnessed at the Special Convention—that I was fearful congregations had been organized, with a view to this object, in a hasty manner. He expressed his hope that this had not been the exclusive object, and that spiritual good would be the eventual result, in which I united. *After this, and notwithstanding all the pains I had taken to convince him of the injurious nature of the measure, unless taken up by our own vestry, and acted upon as a branch of our own charge, he went to Mr. Duffield's, in Frankford, on his way to the city, and inquired of him what he thought of organizing a church at that borough.* The old gentleman, from his accurate knowledge of our situation, and alarmed at his proposal, wished to know where the funds were to come from to build their church: that he utterly disapproved of the city custom of building on credit; and, that even if there was a new church erected, that he was so decidedly partial to the preaching of the present rector, that he should not feel willing for any other person to officiate in it. The next appointment at the Academy, was not supplied with a preacher. The people met and dispersed, without service, and thus the affair terminated."

Whether this history does not bear out my statement, let the public judge: and let them observe, too, that the very worst feature of this transaction, in a moral point of view, the *avowed design* of the attempt is *not* contradicted, nor denied by "Plain Fact;" and is now, even more broadly than I had asserted it, undeniably substantiated. I feel myself fully justified in restating the facts—that Mr. Ridgely came into this diocese, as a candidate for orders, from Virginia; was ordained by Bishop White, October 13th, 1825; left this diocese soon after his ordination, and returned to it but a month before the Special Convention; was then engaged by the Rev. Mr. Bedell, as his assistant, by a private arrangement unknown to his vestry and congregation; and is here presented to us as the active agent of a party arrayed against his bishop; who, in a pamphlet not publicly disavowed by them, is unequivocally denounced, with all those who have rallied round his person and his principles, as opposed to truth and piety.

16. The case of Mr. Robbins is the next I shall examine. I had said that Mr. Robbins had publicly insulted the bishop by expressing his conviction that the bishop would not act impartially in appointing

a committee to accelerate the organization of the Convention, and that this insult was never publicly retracted. This statement is *not denied*. In explanation you say that Mr. Robbins expressed himself on the occasion in a "most frank and good natured manner." This you must allow me to remark, is a very curious apology. Were I to tell you in a public body, in a manner cool, "frank, and good natured," that you were a liar or a thief, would the calmness of the accusation be any excuse for the insult? As a further apology for Mr. Robbins, you intimate that he "*had good reasons for the opinion he expressed*.* Whether this insinuation does not make the matter worse than before, I leave the reader to judge. Mr. Robbins apologised to Bishop White in private, but there was never heard from him a retraction or explanation in the presence of that Convention before whom, the charge of apprehended partiality was made. In a note appended to your remarks on this point,† you assert that the appointment of a committee to examine the credentials presented, and to report who were members of the Convention, was of "an entirely novel character." Had you been longer in the diocese than you have, you would have known that the same proposition had been made at the Convention at Norristown in 1824, though not acted upon; and that the secretary of the Convention had before expressed a desire that the responsibility of challenging the certificates of the lay deputies, which by the ordinary mode of organizing the Convention was devolved upon him, might be placed, where it obviously ought to rest, with a committee of the body. Your additional observation in that note that the appointment of a committee "might have put it in *their* power [that of the bishop's friends] to have formed just such a Convention as they pleased,"‡ besides evincing an utter ignorance of the object of the proposed measure, constitutes almost as gross an insult to the bishop, (who would have had the appointment of the committee,) as the original remark of Mr. Robbins himself. And the plain truth is that this determination, on the part of Mr. Meade's friends, not to *trust* the bishop, who is the official president of the Convention, to appoint a committee, least he should appoint them *all of one side*, (to use the precise expression of Mr. Robbins,) was the real reason that the organization of that body was so long, and so vexatiously protracted.

17. In relation to the Circular of "a Fellow Layman," which I had characterized as a hasty, irritating, and inconclusive production, you admit the fact of its having been issued; and consigning the Circular with my criticisms to the judgment of the public, you attempt to excite a belief that the object of some of my remarks was to set the author of it "at enmity with his pastor."§ And truly had I charged Dr. Coxe with being "a man of weak mind and perverse disposition," or expressed any such opinion of his character, or furnished any ground for any candid reader to believe that I ever *thought* him to

* P. F. p. 24.

† P. F. p. 23.

‡ P. F. p. 23, note.

§ P. F. p. 24.

be such, it is possible I might be suspected of the design you mention. But as it is, your single allusion to the bare possibility of any man indulging the supposition that what is said in the "Candid Address" *could* so operate upon the views of that gentleman, is a greater insult to his understanding and his heart, than any language to be culled from the writings of "Plain Truth."

18. The case of the Female Domestic Missionary Society of St Andrew's church is discussed in a previous portion of this pamphlet to which I must refer you for the facts, and bearings of the matter. So far, however, as the ladies who compose that institution are concerned in this affair, I have to say that neither has their zeal been questioned, their piety doubted, their efforts marred, nor their liberality checked by the bishop or any of his friends. The attitude of independence in which, as an association, they stand, is an attitude in which they have been placed, not so much by themselves as by others. An opportunity is here afforded me, also, to state what I omitted to mention when reviewing this point before, that prior to the employment of any missionary by that association, the bishop, at the request of some of the clergy who conceived the prospect of collisions to be opening through this avenue, and were desirous of amicably preventing them, had an interview with the Rev. Mr. Bedell upon the subject, who informed the bishop that the object of the society was to maintain a domestic missionary to preach to those poor people who could not, on account of the expense, procure sittings in St. Andrew's church; and that the locality of the proposed mission was to be beyond the Centre Square, at or near the banks of the Schuylkill. When the missionary was engaged he was located in Ninth street between Race and Vine streets, and about four or five squares from St. Stephen's and St. James' churches.

I have now gone over the material statements of the "Candid Address," which have been admitted, or at least have not been denied by you, and have endeavoured, I trust, with a single eye to truth, to reply to the attempts you have made to give them a different colouring, and a less obnoxious aspect than the one in which I had presented them to public view. How far I have succeeded in my endeavour, I leave those who read what we both have written to determine for themselves, without indulging any apprehensions as to the nature of their decision. Before however, I proceed to the general observations with which I mean to conclude this pamphlet, I have to notice some of your open *denials* of what I have stated; and some of your positive *assertions*, which are not altogether conformable to plain facts. Your unequivocal DENIALS amount to three.

1. You deny that the Rev. Mr. Boyd, and the Rev. Mr. Bedell, are candidates for the Assistant Bishopric of this diocese: and tell me, "there is no candidate at all on the evangelical side, and indeed cannot be, till they assemble at Harrisburgh."* Now, what has this representation in it contradictory to my assertion? Look at my state-

* P. Fact, p. 12.

ment—"Mr. Bedell and Mr. Boyd, are *publicly spoken of* as candidates for the office of Assistant Bishop."* And again, "two of them (the Committee of Correspondence,) are *now before the public* as candidates for the office of Assistant Bishop of this state."† When you can disprove these assertions, and are able to deny, that either of these gentlemen has been publicly spoken of in connexion with this office, then your denial will be admitted to be applicable. Again, it is a statement which I have no hesitation in saying, you will not venture to controvert, that these gentlemen have been *voted for* as candidates for the office, at a meeting of their friends.‡ That neither of these gentlemen will be taken up as the candidate at Harrisburgh, it needs no spirit of prophecy to foretell, after the disclosure and publication of the "Circular-confidential." That production has cast a cloud upon their prospects of episcopal preferment, too dark, cumbersome, and gloomy, I fear, ever to be dispelled. 2. Your next denial is, that these reverend gentlemen have electioneered for themselves. The charge of electioneering was founded upon their "Circular," the genuineness and authenticity of which you admit, and with them all its contents. If this Circular was issued before either of them was spoken of as candidate, then in this way they have not been guilty of electioneering: If, however, the date of its emanation is posterior to the time when they had been spoken of in connexion with the office, and especially, if it be later than the period when any meeting and voting on the subject had occurred, then I fear they must continue, notwithstanding the stern requisitions of *official* responsibility, to lie under this awkward and uncomfortable imputation. When, therefore, "Plain Fact" shall inform the public of the *dates* of these several transactions, the matter can be settled. But 3. You deny that Mr. Boyd travelled through the diocese, and represented Dr. Wilson as unsound on some points of doctrine. Now, I am authorized to say by a gentleman from the country, to whom Mr. Boyd addressed some observations to that effect, that he did so represent Dr. Wilson as unsound in the faith. Observe, that I do not question Mr. Boyd's right to do so. The point to be settled, is a point of fact. That this reverend gentleman visited Chester county, Lancaster, Lycoming county, Wilkesbarre, and the Beech woods during the summer, will not, and cannot be denied, and that during the excursion, he endeavoured to prove to several persons, from the writings of Dr. Wilson, that he held erroneous opinions on some essential doctrine of the gospel, besides the above attestation, that of several others can be adduced.

From these denials, I turn to your **ASSERTIONS**. Those which relate to the bishop's friends, having as a body held private meetings at the Special Convention, and raised funds to offer to pay the expenses of deputies to that body, have already been denied. Three others deserve notice. 1. You affirm, that the Rev. Mr. Sitgreaves "came

* P. Truth, p. 21.

† P. Truth, p. 24.

‡ Abundant proof of this is within my reach if it is denied.

into the diocese on the *second* day of the Convention.”* The facts are these, viz.: that Mr. Sitgreaves had been residing, as the Journal† states, for some time at Easton *in this state*; that domestic circumstances had compelled him to resign his church at Auburn, in New York, and return to this diocese, where he now is; that he had informed Bishop White of his intended connexion with this diocese, that his letters of dismission from Bishop Hobart did not arrive until the first day of the Convention. 2. You assert, that it is *positively true*, that circumstances had come to the *knowledge* of the Committee of Correspondence, which convinced them, that “the friends of Dr. Wilson were making *every* effort to secure a majority in the next Convention, and that no expedient would be left untried to alter the character of the lay delegation from the churches which were opposed to him.”‡ At the period when the committee penned their Circular, January 22d, 1827, the friends of Dr. Wilson, instead of being engaged in making *every effort* to secure a majority in the next Convention, and to alter the character of the lay delegation, had done nothing. All that the ten signers of the Letter had done at that date, I am authorized by them to state, was the issuing of the Circular relating to the proposal of Mr. Meade. And both yourself and the committee may be boldly challenged to produce any proof that Dr. Wilson’s friends, as a body, or generally, were making *any* effort in regard to the next Convention, when that “Circular-confidential” was sent abroad. 3. Your third assertion is, that “Dr. Wilson is essentially defective in his religious views and church principles.”|| I call this an assertion: for although your phraseology is somewhat equivocal, yet its connexion with the subject, will, I think, force every one to admit, that you must have meant it as a distinct avowal at least of your belief on the point. But whether it be called an assertion, or a mere intimation against the reverend professor, it is one of a most solemn and trying nature. If it be true, it would become the trustees of the General Theological Seminary as well as the General Convention, to inquire into the fact, and dispossess that reverend gentleman of a most responsible office which he now sustains in that institution, to the satisfaction of his brother professors and the trustees, to the honour of himself, and with the love, admiration, and respect of his pupils. But whence does this accusation issue? From the Rev. Mr. Boyd, and the author of “Plain Fact,” who has stamped such an image of himself upon his pamphlet, as to leave no one in doubt to whom it should be ascribed. And what are the *qualifications* of these gentlemen to occupy the judgment seat, and issue this sentence against the reverend professor? Let them be ascertained by the perusal of the “Confidential-circular,” of the former, and by the study of this subdued, temperate, holy and christian production of the latter, which I have been reviewing; works which have called forth a loud, deep, wide spread and lasting reprobation from the

* P. Fact, p. 22.

‡ P. Truth, p. 18.

† Journal of Special Convention, p.

|| P. Fact, p. 20.

public, and on which the authors will have the melancholy satisfaction of inscribing the words of the poet—

“Exegi monumentum ære perennius.”

After all, Dr. Wilson is allowed the consolation of knowing, that he shares the excommunication from the pale of orthodoxy, truth, and piety, which has been poured forth by this self-constituted tribunal, to neither of whom is he but slightly known, in company with the bishop and half of his brethren in this diocese; and should he feel at all inclined to despond under the sentence, he may confidently be encouraged with the hope, that as his judges have not always been *very consistent* supporters of their views, the revolution of opinions may yet produce even from them a recall of their sentence, and his restoration to the character of which they have attempted to divest him.

In casting back a look over the wide field of discussion which this affair has opened, my eye rests on a variety of topics, to which as yet no allusion has been made. Any thing more than a very hasty reference to these, would swell this pamphlet to a size no way proportioned to the importance of the topics themselves.

The various sophistries of both “Plain Truth, Junior,” and “Plain Fact;” the heterogeneous mixture of politics, and prayer to be noted in the “Circular” of Messrs. Boyd, &c.; the attempt of “Plain Fact,” to attach an obnoxious appellative to the bishop’s friends; his effort to induce the members of the church to array themselves against the *law* of the Convention, ordaining collections for the episcopal fund;* the disingenuous appeal to the prejudices of other persuasions of christians; the inconsistency of some of the “committee of correspondence,” in pressing the election of an assistant bishop *now*, which, prior to the late Special Convention, was pronounced by them a measure so utterly inexpedient;† the reluctance, (and actual refusal for a time,) of their whole party in the Special Convention, to amend the minutes respecting the election of an assistant bishop, by inserting some omitted facts; the efforts of Messrs. Boyd and Bedell in that body, to prevent Mr. Nash from replying to questions respectfully put to him, calculated to elicit the facts connected with his claim to a seat; the awkward attempt of “Plain Fact,” to exhibit “the spirit of love”‡ in replying to “Plain Truth;” all these are points

* P. F. p. 10.

† The bishop’s friends have at least been consistent in this matter. They still maintain the abstract importance of the measure; but they were once prepared, and did consent to relinquish their views for the sake of peace, and on account of the distractions of the diocese.

‡ That my readers may see some of “Plain Fact’s” promises and performances on this subject in happy apposition, I transcribe a few sentences in opposite columns :—

which would furnish fruitful themes, as well as some happy illustrations of the character of that party in this diocese, which, under the management and conduct of a few clergymen and laymen, has raised the banner of an interminable war against, (as must be admitted if the pamphlet of "Plain Fact" be not publicly disavowed by them,) the persons, the feelings, the characters, as well as the opinions and policy of the bishop and his friends.

I cannot conclude this pamphlet, without protesting in the name of these gentlemen, against the unfounded representation made by "Plain Fact," and so frequently heard from the lips of the party whose cause he has espoused, that the opponents of the bishop, are the *only* friends of evangelical religion in this diocese. In behalf of the bishop and his clergy, I claim for them the appellation of *evangelical*; not in any party acceptance of the term, but as denoting a character and views conformable to the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. On this point the proof is to be looked for, however, neither on one side nor the other, in *words*, or in *professions*. And how far our brethren

1. "I feel a paramount obligation laid upon me to follow him, who, when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to Him that judgeth righteously."—p. 3.

2. Again: "I would wish, then, in all that I shall say upon this occasion to manifest nothing but the meekness of wisdom, and the spirit of love."—p. 3.

"The cause of scriptural truth and piety never gains by ill-natured sneers, reproaches, or misrepresentations."—p. 3.

"Hence every thing like unholy sarcasm, &c.—I would fain avoid."—p. 4.

1. "And how any stomach of mortal man could stand such a fulsome load as this *hollow hearted sycophant* here offers to the right reverend the bishop, is to me wonderful beyond expression."—See appendix. In this same page "an Episcopalian" is accused by this unreviling author, of "falsehood," "hypocrisy," "baseness," "cruelty," &c. &c.

2. The author of the "Candid Address" is denominated a "*vile tool*."—p. 19.

Dr. Wilson is pronounced to "be *essentially defective* in his religious views, and church principles."—p. 20.

The Right Rev. Bishop White is compared to "a pitiable wreck on the boisterous billows."—p. 27.

The whole body of the bishop's friends are said to be fully agreed in nothing "except in opposing the cause of 'truth and piety.'"—p. 26.

In a note on page 18, an anecdote is related of an occurrence which took place at the door of a church, respecting some individual having said that he would *as leave see the devil as Mr. Boyd*, and expressed a hope that Mr. *Bedell would die*: which observations are laid to the charge of the pamphlets of "Plain Truth," and "An Episcopalian." It is somewhat difficult to discover the connexion between the two circumstances, even allowing the anecdote to be a fact; of which some doubt will be entertained when it is known that the sexton, as I am informed, is *in the hands of the Law* for the defamation. At all events it is to be hoped that "Plain Fact" will not refer to the pamphlets of "Plain Truth," and his kindred spirit "An Episcopalian," in justification of *his* diabolical feelings and expressions, inasmuch as he professes to have *avoided the manner and spirit* of the first of these two gentlemen, and to have "forgotten as soon as possible" the production of the second.

have shown themselves the *exclusive* possessors, maintainers, and exhibitors of the evangelical principles and spirit of the gospel, let the circumstances developed in the course of these discussions, and the comparative temper and feeling manifested by the parties concerned, be appealed to as aiding to determine the question.

When, in the course of the preceding pages, allusions are made to individuals of other denominations than our own, I have to request the reader to understand them as they are meant, to be expressive of no feeling nor intention of disrespect; and as having been called for only by the connexions of the subject.

The declining days of our venerable Father in God, had been, one might have imagined, sufficiently harassed before the appearance of this, as it has been frequently denominated *atrocious* pamphlet. It is to be hoped, that now the cup of his indignities is full. The sun of his kindred Spirit in the political world, as it descended from the view of men, was obscured (not tarnished) by the clouds of unmerited and cruel obloquy, and a similar destiny is now, in the mysterious dispensations of God, allotted to him who may be said to have founded a new church, as the former did a new empire; and who, having lived to see his own immediate portion of it augmented from seventeen congregations to fifty-four, and from six clergymen to sixty, is in the very last moments of an eventful, trying, laborious, and consistent life, denounced as an enemy to the spiritual kingdom of God, an opposer of truth and piety. The ruthless hand of party excitement has spared neither his character, his feelings, nor his principles. He has lived to see a few misguided youths, to all of whom he had extended the cordial hand of welcome, when at different, but not remote, intervals they entered his diocese, and to none of whom has he ever manifested the least unkindness, leagued together in hostility against him, organizing an array of partisans to uphold them in the war which they have waged, raising before his very face the standard, and proclaiming in his very ears the notes, of deliberate and determined opposition; and now, because there are some who have not yet laid aside their veneration for age, their affection for his person, and their respect for his principles, he is held up, by one of the champions of the party, (who has been *not one year* within the diocese,) as an object of mockery and ridicule, pronounced to be "daubed with untempered mortar," represented as "the mighty stone," with which faithful men are to be "*crushed*;" declared to be the instrument of a "dastardly stratagem;" and to cap the climax of unfeeling obloquy, is depicted to the public eye as "a pitiable wreck on the boisterous billows." With the knowledge of these things, who can repress the supplication, "Arise, O Lord, and have mercy upon Zion, for it is time that thou have mercy upon her—yea, the time is come—And why? Thy servants think upon her stones, and it pitieth them to see her in the dust?"

PLAIN TRUTH.

